BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* JULY, 1909. No. 27.

THE GOAL IN SIGHT.

THE steady and persistent labours during the past thirty years of the members of the Bacon Society appear at last to be making some impression. Gradually the case for the impossibility of attributing the poems and plays to the Stratford Shakespeare has been built up in such strength that no jury of average intelligent men, considering the evidence in an impartial spirit, could do other than return a verdict against the accepted authorship.

Concurrently coincidences, facts and theories have been gathered together which so strongly point to Francis Bacon as the author that at least there is sufficient support for the hypothesis to justify its serious consideration. By far the most powerful work advocating this view, on what may be termed orthodox Baconian lines, is "Francis Bacon—Our Shakespeare,"* by the late Mr. Edwin Reed.

The arguments contained therein may be supplemented by many important points, to which attention has been directed since its issue; but no impartial person could digest Mr. Reed's book without admitting that the chances were at least even that its title represented a fact.

* Gay & Bird, 1902.

That Bacon had made use of his biliteral cipher (invented by him during his sojourn in France, referred to in the "Advancement of Learning," 1605, and fully explained in the "De Augmentis Scientiarum," 1623) was to be expected. When, therefore, Mrs. Gallup announced that she had discovered its use, not only in Bacon's works but in the 1623 folio edition of Shakespeare's plays and other works of the period, there was nothing inconsistent with probabilities. Mrs. Gallup has many strong supporters, but many ardent Baconians refuse to admit that the evidence in favour of the use of the cipher as alleged is convincing. They contend that corroboration is lacking. The subject is one of great intricacy and difficulty. The fact that it may be affirmed that so far only Mrs. Gallup has been able to decipher on any practicable scale is probably the stumbling-block to many who are willing to approach the subject without prejudice. The controversy which arose on the biliteral cipher caused a set-back to the Baconian case. Ninety-nine out of every hundred men now, practising literature, are quite ignorant of the important part which ciphers played in the conduct of the affairs of nations, societies, and individuals in the sixteenth century. The opponents of the Baconian theory traded on this ignorance for all it was worth. The cipher was a fair subject for ridicule and satire. The Press, generally conducted in these degenerate days by men of superficiality, compelled by the position they occupy to assume a pose of authority on subjects as to which they are profoundly ignorant, threw all its influence against Mrs. Gallup; but if public opinion was against her, she was never proved to be an impostor. Those who know her best speak of her honesty and self-sacrifice in the highest terms, and it may yet be demonstrated that she has accomplished the greatest literary feat of any woman, living or dead.

Judge Webbs' "The Mystery of William Shakespeare" and Lord Penzance's summing up to the jury, strong in their forcible argument, left the matter much as it was. "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title," by Judge Stotsenburg, followed in 1904. This volume has never in England received the attention which it deserved. It contains a masterly examination of the vocabularies and peculiarities of style of the principal poets and dramatic writers of the Elizabethan period.

It was not until June of 1908, when "The Shakespeare Problem Restated," from the pen of Mr. G. Greenwood, M.P., appeared, that public attention to the controversy was again aroused. Here was a book, written by a barrister and a scholar, who was also a Member of Parliament, who refused acquiescence in the belief that Bacon was the author, but who in a most unmerciful manner attacked and demolished the Stratford citadel. There are honest critics, and these were compelled to acknowledge that Mr. Greenwood had made out a case which required answering. Canon Beeching in a feeble and half-hearted manner attempted the task, but as misrepresentation was his chief weapon Mr. Greenwood had little difficulty in effectually disposing of his assault. Then Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart., renewed the attack in the *Nineteenth Century* for April and May, and in the June number, Mr. Greenwood, although his reply was unfairly shortened and mauled by the Editor, placed the Baronet *hors de combat.*

The reviewers had barely laid down their pens from the consideration of "The Shakespeare Problem Restated" when a chapter of Mark Twain's autobiography, under the title of "Is Shakespeare Dead?" was placed before them, and they found the man whose name has always stood for sound common-sense ranged in line

with the Baconians with a confidence that cannot be questioned.

Most of the Shakespearean reviewers, instead of meeting Mark Twain in fair encounter, ride off with the quibble that he is a humorist, and his book is only to be treated as a great practical joke. The able writer in the *Westminster Review*, however, commences his notice of the book by boldly stating: "My intended subscription to the Shakespeare Memorial is held in abeyance. Doubts assail my mind." No champion now sets forth to do battle for the old superstitious belief, and Baconians are noticing that there is a general tendency among those brilliant scholars of Elizabethan literature who constitute themselves guardians of William Shakspere's literary reputation to keep out of sight and hearing.

So far as the intellectual forum is concerned, the attack on Shakspere's authorship has succeeded beyond question, and the claims made for Bacon's authorship are so far conclusive as to leave little reasonable doubt. But as Mr. Hillaire Belloc averred in an article in the *Morning Post*, referred to in the last number of BACONIANA, the plain man will require more than intellectual proof before setting aside a title based on possession for upwards of three hundred years; he will require some mechanical proof which will stand the test of close scrutiny.

Such a proof would be the records alleged to have been made by means of the biliteral cipher; but until others besides Mrs. Gallup can decipher and corroborate her, the plain man refuses to accept her testimony.

At this interesting stage of the controversy Messrs. Constable and Co. publish a work by Mr. William Stone Booth on "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," which is dealt with elsewhere in these

columns. Here surely is that mechanical proof for which Mr. Belloc asked. It is a singular fact that up to the present time, although the book has been in the reviewers' hands for some weeks, no notice of it has appeared—at any rate, in any of the leading daily or weekly papers. It is true that Mr. William Archer has made some references to it in a column of gossip which he provides for the *Morning Leader*, but some of his contentions he admits were founded on error, and, as to the rest, they bear evidence that he has failed to grasp the problem which Mr. Booth advances.

In a few weeks will be published another work by Mr. E. V. Tanner, giving mechanical proof of the most remarkable character of the existence of a cipher in the lines "To the Reader," prefixed to the folio edition of Shakespeare's plays. There will be no difficulty about proof in this case. Every schoolboy will be able to verify Mr. Tanner's most ingenious discoveries.

And then—what next? A further mechanical proof of such a character that the plain man will stand aghast. Any evening a bomb may be thrown into the literary world which will cause a cataclysm in which the literary reputation of that silent man of Stratford will be engulfed with those of the Lees, Beechings, and other distinguished men of letters who "know so much that is not so." The mills of Francis Bacon have been grinding very slowly but very surely, and within a very short period those who, acting under his instructions, have been turning the stones will see him enter into his kingdom with undisputed sovereignty. That will be their reward, but it will be sufficient.

BACON ON THE STAGE.

STRATFORDIANS contend that Bacon had little sympathy with and no knowledge of the stage, or of stage-craft. To prove that there is no foundation in fact for the statements I proffer the following quotations from his prose works, letters, speeches, etc. The truth is that he was so keenly in touch with the best aims of the theatre and its operations that he continually turned to the stage and stage-craft for the expressions of his ideas in speaking and writing on very different matters.

Allusions to Shake-speare's Plays.

Sir Francis Bacon's "*Apology concerning Essex addressed to the Earl of Devonshire,*" contains extraordinary admissions.*

"I remember an answer of mine in a matter which had some affinity with my Lord's (Essex) cause, which though it grew from me went about in other's names. For Her Majesty being mightily incensed with that book which was dedicated to my Lord of Essex being a Story of the first years of King Henry IV., thinking it a seditious prelude, to put into the people's heads boldness and faction, said she had an opinion that there was treason in it. . . . The Queen would not be persuaded that it was his writing whose name was to it, but that it had some more mischievous author."

The next passage proves that "the matter" alluded to was the "Book of Henry IV.," and also that Bacon wrote it :—

"The next news that I heard was . . . it was allotted to me that I should set forth some undutiful carriage of my Lord in giving occasion and

* Vol. I., *Bacon's Works*, p. 436. Published by William Ball.

countenance to a seditious pamphlet, as it was termed, which was the Book, before mentioned, of King Henry IV. Whereupon I replied to that allotment . . . that it was an old matter, and had no manner of coherence with the rest of the Charge . . . and therefore that I having been wronged by bruits before, this would expose me to them more; and it would be said I gave in evidence mine own tales."*

To prove that it was a play of Shake-speare which is here alluded to I quote from "*A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Committed by Robert, late Earl of Essex.*"†

"To prove him privy to the plot it was given in evidence . . . that the afternoon before the rebellion, Merick, with a great company of others that afterwards were all in the action, had procured to be played before them the Play of Deposition of King Richard the Second. Neither was it casual, but a Play bespoken by Merick. And not so only, but when he was told by one of the Players, that the Play was old,‡ and they should have lost in playing it, because few would come to it; there were forty shillings extraordinary given to play it, and so therupon played it was. So earnest he was to satisfy his eyes with the sight of that Tragedy, which he thought soon after his Lordship should bring from the Stage to the State, but that God turned it upon their own heads."

In *The Proceedings of the Earl of Essex* we find—

"About that time there did fly about in London streets and Theatres divers seditious libels etc."§

In Apophthegm 21 the subject is again treated of.

* *Ibid*, p. 438. † *Ibid*, p. 424.
‡ Bacon had said in a former paragraph, "It was an old matter."
§ *Ibid*, p. 403.

"The book of Deposing King Richard II. and the Coming in of Henry IV., supposed to be written by D. Hayward, who was committed to the Tower for it, had much incensed Queen Elizabeth and she asked Mr. Bacon, being then her counsel learned, whether there were any treason contained in it?"

Again in James' reign Bacon alludes to the Shakespeare play in his "Charge against Mr. Oliver St. John."

"This gentleman, not suddenly by his pen . . . not privately, . . . but publickly as it were, . . . slandered and traduced the King. . . . Intending, as it seems, to play prizes, . . . would bring his papers upon the Stage.

"In this writing is a wicked and seditious slander; setting him (the King) forth for . . . a match for a Richard the Second. . . . Now Mr. I. S. . . . for your comparison with Richard II., I see you follow the example of them that brought him upon the Stage and into print in Queen Elizabeth's time." *

When Lambard, keeper of the Records, waited upon her at the Palace, she exclaimed to him, "I am Richard, know you not that?" †

DOUBTFUL ALLUSIONS.

"I shall not promise you weight for weight but Measure for Measure" (*Letter to Tobie Mathew*).

"In some Comedies of Errors . . . the Mistress and the Maid change habits" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"So well sorted with a Play of Errors" (*Grays Inn Masque*).

"More willing to hear Julius Cæsar than Queen Elizabeth commended" (*To Tobie Mathew*).

* *Works*, Vol. I., pp. 689, 691, 692.

† *Story of Lord Bacon's Life.* By Hepworth Dixon. P. 156.

"We see Brutus and Cassius invited to a supper certain whose opinion they meant to feel" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"All is well that endes well" (*Promus*, 949).

With Regard to the Stage.

In the charges by His Majesty's Attorney-General against the Earl and Countess of Somerset concerning Sir Thomas Overbury, Sir Francis Bacon speaks like a stage manager:—

"The great frame of justice, my Lords, in this present action, hath a Vault, and hath a Stage: a Vault, wherein these works of darkness were contrived, and a Stage with steps by which it was brought to light." *

"I will . . . hold myself to that which I called the Stage, or Theatre, whereunto indeed it may be fitly compared: for that things were first contained within the invisible judgments of God, as within a Curtain,† and after came forth and were acted most worthily by the king, and right well by his ministers." ‡

"Things stood by the space almost of two years during which time God . . . did bind and nail . . . fast the Actors and instruments . . . as neither the one looked about them nor the other stirred or fled." §

"Then follow the proceedings of Justice against the other offenders . . . all these being but the organs and instruments of this fact, the Actors and not the Authors . . . But, my lords, where I speak of a Stage, I doubt I hold you upon the Stage too long." ‖

And again, "Certainly, my lords, the Tragical misery of that poor gentleman, Overbury, ought somewhat to obliterate his faults." ¶

* *Works*, Vol. I. p. 702.
† Name of first Play House, The Curtain.
‡ *Works*, Vol. I. p. 703. § *Ibid*, p. 703. ‖ *Ibid*, p. 704.
¶ *Ibid*, p. 706.

"Weston was the Actor or Mechanical party in this imposionment."

"Weston . . . was the principal Actor in the impoisonment."

"Thus when they heard this poor gentleman in the Tower . . . then was the time to execute the last Act of this Tragedy."

(To Somerset): "You were the principal Actor and had your hand in all those Acts."

"Because there must be a time for the Tragedy to be acted . . . Overbury must be held in the Tower."

And, again, see "*The Charge of the King's Attorney-General against Mr. Lumsden*," etc.*:—

"For this His Majesty's virtue of justice God hath of late raised an occasion and erected as it were a Stage or Theatre much to his honour, for him to shew it and act it in the pursuit of the untimely death of Sir Thomas Overbury."

"No inglorious exit from the Stage" (*Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*, Latin ed., pub. by Rawley, 1608).

"Allen that was the Player . . . I like well that Allen playeth the last Act of his life so well" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"The Scene of the Tragedy is changed, and it is a new Act to begin" (*War with Spain.*")

"All would be but a play upon the Stage, if Justice went not on in the right course" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Where a man cannot fitly play his own Part if he hath not a friend, he may quit the stage" (*Essay of Friendship*).

"Borrow a horse and armour for some Public Show" (*Letter to Salisbury*).

"The colours that show best by candle-light are white, carnation, and a kind of sea-water green, and ounches and spangs" (*Essay of Masques*).

* *Ibid*, p. 695.

"Naked and open daylight . . . doth not show the Masques and Mummeries half stately and daintily as candle lights" (*Essay of Truth*).

"He thought after the manner ot Stage-Plays and Masques to show . . . afar off, and therefore . . . sailed into Ireland" (*Henry VII.*).

"One of the aptest particulars that hath come or can come upon the Stage" (*Letter to Essex*).

"Those that dance too long Galliards . . . take them off, and bring others on" (*Essay of Discourse*).

"A good Cross-Point but worst Cinq-a-pace" (*Promus*).

"The foolish bird playeth the ape in gesture" (*Nat. History*).

"Moving the head or hand too much . . . sheweth a fantastical, light, and fickle operation of the spirit, Consequently like mind as gesture . . . use a modest action in either" (*Short Notes*).

"When . . . business comes upon the Stage I carry it with strength and resolution" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Stories invented for the Stage are neater, more elegant, and more agreeable to the taste than . . . true Stories" (*Novum Organum*).

"An Ædilio; one that should have set forth some magnificent Shows or Plays (*Advancement of Learning*, Book II.).

"An Action which seldom cometh upon the Stage" (*Advancement of Learning*, Book II.).

"It was one of the longest Plays of that kind that hath been in memory" (*Henry VII.*).

"Neither do I judge of the Play by the First Act" (*Letter to Essex*).

"Inconstancy of Fortune with inconstancy of mind makes a dark Scene" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"These things should not be Staged" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Momus seeing in the frame of Man's heart such angles and recesses, found fault there was not a window to look into it. This window we can obtain" (*De Augmentis*).

"Like to reflexions in Looking Glasses" (*Nat. History*).

"The curious window into hearts of which the Ancients speak" (*Device of the Indian Prince*).

"Give me leave to set before you two glasses, such as never met in one age, the Glass of France, and the Glass of England" (*Attorney-General's Speech*).

"It is more than time that there was an end and surcease made . . . whereby matters of religion is handled in the style of the Stage" (*Of the Church*).

"The Stage is more beholding to Love than the life of man" (*Essay of Love*).

"As the tongue speaketh to the ear so the Gesture to the eye."

"He played as if he had been upon the Stage" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"A virtuous man will be virtuous *in-solitudine* in a desert, and not only in *Theatro* upon the Stage" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"One and one other are sufficient for the largest Stage (*Promus*).

"A perfect Palace . . . I would have only one goodly room above stairs, of fifty feet at least high. And under it a room of the same length and width, for a Dressing or Preparing place at Feasts, Plays and such Magnificencies, and to receive conveniently the Actors while dressing and preparing" (*Essay of Building*, Posthumous edition).

"I do not desire to Stage myself, nor my pretensions, but for the comfort of a private life" (*La: Buckingham*).

"Wherein he hath already so well profited . . . this entrance upon the Stage" (*Letter to the King*).

"In this entrance upon the Stage . . . he (Villiers) hath not committed any manifest error" (*Letter to King James*, clvii.).

"Who would not be offended at one that cometh into the pulpit, as if he came upon the Stage to play parts?" (*Of the Church*, Touching a preaching Ministry).

"What can be more disagreeable than in common life to copy the Stage?" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"Let Anti-Masques not be too long; they have been commonly of fools, satyrs, baboons, wild men, antics, beasts, spirits, witches, Ethiopes, pigmies, turquets, nymphs, rustics, Cupids, statues moving, and the like" (*Essay of Masques*).

"Let the suit of the Maskers be graceful, and such as become the person when the vizards are off . . . . let the music . . . . be recreative. Double Masques, one of men another of ladies addeth state and variety" (*Ibid*).

"Will be ready to furnish a Masque" (*Letter to Burleigh*).

"Many other Plays of the same kind might be put together and harmonised" (*Novum Organum*).

"The alteration of scenes, so it be quickly and without noise are things of great beauty and pleasure" (*Essay of Masques*).

"Acting in song, especially in Dialogues, hath an extreme good grace, Acting, not dancing, for that is a mean and vulgar thing" (*Ibid*).

"Arts . . . are judged by Acts and Master-Pieces as I may term them" (*Advancement of Learning*).

Remarks about Stage-players or Actors.

"Stage-Players . . . . by this faculty of Playing" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Such who themselves have been Actors on the Stage" (*Essay of Counsel*).

"A good Comediante" (*Promus*).

"First appearance upon the Stage in . . . . new character" (*Henry VII.*).

"A Player, who, if he were left out of his auditory and their applause he would straight be out of heart and countenance" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"Action . . . . that part of an orator which is but superficial, and rather the virtue of a Player" (*Essay of Boldness*).

"Acting the part of a prince handsomely" (*Henry VII.*).

"Advise you whether you will play the Honest Man or no" (*Letter to Kempe*).

"They would make you a King in a Play" (*Henry VII.*).

"The Actor or Mechanical party" (*Resuscitatio*).

"Tragedian's Buskin" (*Promus*).

"There be Mountebanks, as well in the civil body as in the natural" (*Memorial of Access*, 1622).

"A Buskin that will serve both legs" (*Promus*).

"Stage-Playing accustoms young men to bear being looked at" (*De Augmentis*).

"Insinuating his purpose to be an Actor" (*A Report*).

"Augustus Cæsar . . . when he died desired his friends about him to give him a *Plaudite* as if he were conscient to himself that he had played his part well upon the Stage (*Adv. of Learning*, Book II.).

"The Epicureans pronounce of the stoical felicity placed in virtue that it is a felicity of a Player . . . they in ridicule call virtue a Theatrical good" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"Such a Mercurial as the like had seldom been known, and could make his own Part if at any time he chanced to be out" (*Ibid*).

"Use this lad to counterfeit and personate . . . frame him and instruct him in the Part" (*Henry VII.*).

"Playing the Prince" (*Ibid*).

"A serious Part" (*Ibid*).

"It is easier to retain the image of a Player acting his Part, than the corresponding notions of Invention and Action" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.),

"Buffoons do draw all things to conceit ridiculous" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Nothing more variable than voices . . . a Buffoon or Pantomimi will express so many as pleaseth" (*Ibid*).

"There be certain Pantomimi that will represent the voices of Players of Interludes so to the life as if you see them not you would think they were those Players themselves, and the voices of other men that they hear" (*Nat. History*).

"Could counterfeit the distance of voices . . . in such sort as when . . . fast by you you would think, the speech came from afar off, in a fearful manner . . . I see . . . use for it in counterfeiting ghosts or spirits" (*Ibid*).

"I thought it not impossible but that I as a looker-on might cast mine eyes upon some things which the Actors themselves . . . did not, or would not see" (*Of the Church*).

"A looker-on often sees more than a Player" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Did set foot on the Stage, and acted new fables neither much applauded or of any elegant argument or subject" (*Experimental History*).

"An Actful, sprightful man" (*Letter to Villiers*).

"Who, when one would think he standeth in great Majesty and felicity, he is troubling to say his Part" (*Gray's Inn Masque*).

"Bashfulness is a great hindrance to a man . . . of uttering his conceit" (*Short Notes*).

"Had you . . . acted your Parts to the best and yet matters should . . . have gone backward there would

be no hopes of amendment, but as it has happened principally through your own errors, if these are corrected all may be recovered" (*De Augmentis*, Book VI.).

"Knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a Book than Play a Part" (*Letter to Bodley*).

"None could hold the Book so well to prompt and instruct . . . Stage-Play as she could" (*Henry VII.*).

"Your life is nothing but a continual acting upon a Stage" (*Queen's Device*).

"There be some whose lives are as if they perpetually played upon the Stage, disguised to all others, open only to themselves" (*Harleian MS.*).

Of the Theatre.

"Theatres and the like are honorable things" (*Offer to King J. of a digest of laws*, p. 671, Vol. I., *Works*).

"Dramatic poetry, which has the Theatre for its world, would be of excellent use if it were sound, for the discipline and corruption of the Theatre is of very great consequence. . . . The action of the Theatre, though modern states esteem it but ludicrous unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the ancients that it might improve mankind in virtue; and indeed many wise men and great philosophers have thought it to the mind as the bow to the fiddle; and certain it is, though a great secret in nature, that the minds of men in company are more open to affections and impressions than when alone" (*De Augmentis*, chap. xiii., p. 97, Edited by Joseph Devey).

"The justest division of poetry . . . (1) Into Narrative. (2) Dramatic. (3) Allegorical. . . . Dramatic poetry is a kind of visible History, giving the images of things as if they were present, whilst History represents them as past" (*Ibid*, p. 96).

"Beholding this noble Action . . . as in a Theatre,

with great admiration" (*Retreat of Gaunt, A War with Spain*).

"Stood all as in a Theatre" (*New Atlantis*).

"In this Theatre of Men's lives, it is reserved for God and the Angels to be lookers on" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Life . . . sends Men headlong into this wretched Theatre, where being arrived, their first language is that of mourning" (*An Essay on Death*, Vol. I., *Works*, etc., William Ball).

"Pedant's hath been scorned upon Theatres, as the ape of tyranny" (*Advancement of Learning*, Book I.).

"By the help and ministry of man . . . another Theatre comes into view" (*Parasceve* and *Hist. Nat.).*

"The Theatre of the Poets" (*Novum Organum*).

"Partakers of God's Theatre shall likewise be partaker of God's rest" (*Essay of Great Place*).

Tragedy and Comedy.

"The deformity of Flattery is Comedy, but the injury Tragedy" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"The things to be seen and observed . . . Comedies, such whereunto the better sort of persons do resort" (*Essay of Travel*).

"Be pleased benignly to bow your ears to hear the Tragedy of a young man that by right ought to hold in his hand the ball of a Kingdom" (*Henry VII.*).

"The Tragedies likewise from them (King's children) have been many" (*Essay of Empire*, 1625).

"Tragedies and Comedies are made of one alphabet" (*Promus*).

"A false or factious Factor, might oftentimes make great Tragedies upon no great ground" (*A Report, Resuscitatio*).

"The Poets in Tragedies do make the most passionate lamentations" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"Fortune doth not commonly bring in a Comedy after a Tragedy" (*Henry VII.*).

"To a good man cruelty means Tragical fiction" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"To turn religion into a Comedy is a thing far from the devout reverence of a Christian" (*Of the Church*).

"As to the Stage love is ever matter of Comedies and now and then of Tragedies, but in life it doth much mischief" (*Essay of Love*, British Museum Copy).

"In a lively Tragedy" (*Queen's Device*).

"Tragedy of calamities . . . Comedies of ridiculous frustrations, and Disappointments" (*Grays Inn Masque*).

I conclude with an application of a line from St. Luke :—

"Of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

"MARK TWAIN" *NOBISCUM.*

"The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."—*Charles Dickens.*

IN his latest work, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" our greatest living humorist has made mince-meat of the Stratford miracle-mongers. Hence it has been left severely alone by newspaper critics. In fact, I have not seen a single review of the volume on this side of the Atlantic. More's the pity, as it deserves a thousand-and-one—at least, from the Baconian point of view. At any rate I shall give him the one with no little pleasure.

Mark is seen in his very best vein in this vigorous onslaught on the "Shakespeare" of tradition, whom he turns inside out in his singularly incisive process of analytical extermination. His dissection of "the man

of Stratford" leaves very few scraps of the original cadaver for the scalpels of subsequent anatomists.

When he was seven years old, Mark tells us in his inimitable style, he "meditated" a biography of no less a personage than Satan and found, on looking into the subject, that "it was 'conjectured'—though not established—that Satan was originally an angel in heaven; that he fell, that he rebelled, and brought on a war; that he was defeated, and banished to perdition. Also, 'we have reason to believe' that later he did so-and-so; that 'we are warranted in supposing' that at a subsequent time he travelled extensively, seeking whom he might devour; that a couple of centuries afterward, 'as tradition instructs us,' he took up the cruel trade of tempting people to their ruin, with vast and fearful results; that by-and-bye, 'as the probabilities seem to indicate,' he may have done certain things, he might have done certain other things, he must have done still other things."

"And so on and so on. We set down the five known facts by themselves, on a piece of paper, and numbered it 'page 1;' then on fifteen hundred other pieces of paper we set down the 'conjectures,' and 'suppositions,' and 'maybes,' and 'perhapses,' and 'doubtlesses,' and 'rumors,' and 'guesses,' and 'probabilities,' and 'likelihoods,' and 'we are permitted to thinks,' and 'we are warranted in believings,' and 'might have beens,' and 'could have beens,' and 'must have beens,' and 'unquestionablys,' and 'without a shadow of doubts'—and behold!

"*Materials?* Why, we had enough to build a biography of Shakespeare!"

He told his Sunday-school teacher—when remonstrated with on his iniquitous project—that he did not wish to "make fun of Satan," but that he "had only a warm desire to make fun of those others and laugh at them." "What others?" asked the teacher. "Why the Supposers, the Perhapsers, the Might-Have-

Beeners, the Could-Have-Beeners, the Must-Have-Beeners, the Without-a-Shadow-of-Doubters, the We-are-Warranted-in-Believingers, and all that funny crop of solemn architects who have taken a good solid foundation of five indisputable and unimportant facts and built upon it a conjectural Satan thirty miles high."

Next, in Chapter III., Mark gently approaches Shakespeare, and this is what he says on this delicate subject :—

"How curious and interesting is the parallel—as far as poverty of biographical details is concerned—between Satan and Shakespeare. It is wonderful, it is unique, it stands quite alone, there is nothing resembling it in history, nothing resembling it in romance, nothing approaching it even in tradition. How sublime is their position, and how overtopping, how sky-reaching, how supreme—the two Great Unknowns, the two Illustrious Conjecturabilities! They are the best-known unknown persons that have ever drawn breath upon the planet.

"For the instruction of the ignorant I will make a list now of those details of Shakespeare's history which are *facts*—verified facts, established facts, undisputed facts."

Then the *facts* of Shakespeare's biography are given as they were *known* to biographers who lived before Dr. Sidney Lee, with passing comments by Mark, such as—

"If Shakespeare had owned a dog—but we need not go into that; we know he would have mentioned it in his will. If a good dog, Susanna would have got it; if an inferior one his wife would have got a dower interest in it. I wish he had had a dog, just so we could see how painstakingly he would have divided that dog among the family, in his careful business way." . . . So far as anyone *knows and can prove*, Shakespeare of Stratford wrote only one poem during his life. This one is authentic. He did write that one—a fact which stands undisputed; he wrote the whole of it; he wrote the whole of it out of his own head. He commanded that this work of art be engraved upon his tomb, and he was obeyed. There it abides to this day. This is it:—

"'Good frend for Iesus sake forbeare,
To digg the dust encloased heare;
Bleste be ye man yt spares thes stones,
And curst be he yt moves my bones.'

"In the list as above set down will be found *every positively known* fact of Shakespeare's life, lean and meagre as the invoice is. Beyond these details we know *not a thing* about him. All the rest of his vast history, as furnished by the biographers, is built up, course upon course, of guesses, inferences, theories, conjectures—an Eiffel Tower of artificialities rising sky-high from a very flat and very thin foundation of inconsequential facts."

Then follows a chapter on "Conjectures," in which appears the following :—

"However, it is 'conjectured' that he accomplished this and more, much more; learned law and its intricacies; and the complex procedure of the law courts; and all about soldiering, and sailoring, and the manners and customs and ways of royal courts and aristocratic society; and likewise accumulated in his one head every kind of knowledge the learned then possessed, and every kind of humble knowledge possessed by the lowly and the ignorant; and added thereto a wider and more intimate knowledge of the world's great literatures, ancient and modern, than was possessed by any other man of his time—for he was going to make brilliant and easy and admiration-compelling use of these splendid treasures the moment he got to London. And according to the surmisers, that is what he did. Yes, although there was no one in Stratford able to teach him these things, and no library in the little village to dig them out of. His father could not read, and even the surmisers surmise that he did not keep a library.

"It is surmised by tbe biographers that the young Shakespeare got his vast knowledge of the law and his familiar acquaintance with the manners and customs and shoptalk of lawyers through being for a time the *clerk of a Stratford court;* just as a bright lad like me, reared in a village on the banks of the Mississippi, might become perfect in knowledge of the Behring Strait whale-fishery and the shop-talk of the veteran exercisers of that adventure-bristling trade through catching catfish with a 'trot-line' Sundays. But the surmise is damaged

by the fact that there is no evidence—and not even tradition—that the young Shakespeare was ever clerk of a law court.

"It is further surmised that the young Shakespeare accumulated his law-treasures in the first years of his sojourn in London, through 'amusing himself' by learning book-law in his garret and by picking up lawyer-talk and the rest of it through loitering about the law courts and listening. But it is only surmise; there is no *evidence* that he ever did either of those things. They are merely a couple of chunks of plaster of Paris. . . . Then in a noble frenzy of poetical inspiration he wrote his one poem—his only poem, his darling—and laid him down and died:

> "'Good frend for Iesus sake forbeare,
> To digg the dust encloased heare;
> Bleste be ye man yt spares thes stones,
> And curst be he yt moves my bones.'

"He was probably dead when he wrote it. Still, this is only conjecture. We have only circumstantial evidence. Internal evidence.

"Shall I set down the rest of the conjectures which constitute the giant biography of William Shakespeare? It would strain the unabridged dictionary to hold them. He is a Brontosaur: nine bones and six hundred barrels of plaster of Paris."

The next chapter is entitled, "We May Assume," which starts:—

"In the Assuming trade three separate and independent cults are transacting business. Two of these cults are known as the Shakespearites and the Baconians, and I am the other one—the Brontosaurian.

"The Shakespearite knows that Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare's Works; the Baconian knows that Francis Bacon wrote them; the Brontosaurian doesn't really know which of them did it, but is quite composedly and contentedly sure that Shakespeare *didn't* and strongly suspects that Bacon *did*. We all have to do a good deal of assuming, but I am fairly certain that in every case I can call to mind the Baconian assumers have come out ahead of the Shakespearites. Both parties handle the same materials, but the Baconians seem to me to get much more reasonable and rational and persuasive results out of them than is the case with the Shakespearites. The Shakespearite conducts his assuming

upon a definite principle, an unchanging and immutable law—which is: 2 and 8 and 7 and 14, added together, made 165. I believe this to be an error. No matter, you cannot get a habit-sodden Shakespearite to cipher-up his materials upon any other basis. With the Baconian it is different. If you place before him the above figures and set him to adding them up, he will never in any case get more than 45 out of them, and in nine cases out of ten he will get just the proper 31."

It is when Mark reaches consideration of the author of the plays as a *lawyer* that he fairly gets into the spirit of the business and gives his opponents some straight hits from the shoulder.

Following Dr. Garnett in the assertion, a writer in the May number of *Blackwood* stated that "though a poet may understand law, no lawyer was ever a poet." I have a sort of hazy recollection that Sir Walter Scott, "a lawyer," was also "a poet," if the *Lady of the Lake*, *Marmion*, and other verses from his pen can be considered "poetry." Sir Walter, of course, had no such opportunity in his *poems* as Shakespeare was afforded in his *dramas* and *sonnets* of introducing law into what he wrote; but in his *novels* Scott did not hesitate to utilize his law for the purpose of his art, giving it through the lips of Pleydell, Fairford, Glossin, Meikleham, Bindloose, Saddletree, Peebles, and other characters. Lowell and Blackstone, both lawyers, also wrote poetry. So did Bacon! Dr. Sidney Lee maintains that "Shakespeare's accurate use of legal terms . . . . *may* be attributable *in part* to his observation of the *many* legal processes in which his father was involved, and *in part* to early intercourse with members of the Inns of Court." Canon Beeching in his weak and evasive reply to Mr. George Greenwood, insists that "Shakespeare's legal phraseology can be traced perhaps to the *innumerable* [better than Dr. Lee's many] law papers belonging to the family suits;" and that "Meanwhile it is satisfactory to observe that if distinguished lawyers of our

own generation can be quoted for the opinion that Shakespeare's knowledge of law implies a professional training, other lawyers, *no less distinguished*, can be quoted on the other side." Who are they, Canon, as compared with Lord Chief Justice Campbell, Lord Penzance, Judge Webb, Judge Holmes, J. C. Hart, T. S. Dixon, Senator Davis, Pitt-Lewis, K.C., Mr. Greenwood, Commissioner Kerr, Russell Lowell, Dr. Furnivall, and Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the New York Shakespeare Society, among others? The only "distinguished lawyer" I know of "on the other side" (if he *was* "distinguished") was E. J. Phelps, Lecturer at Yale, who declared: "As to the law in Shakespeare, there is not enough to qualify an attorney's clerk in all his writings put together." Marvellous! And he was American Ambassador at the Court of Saint James!

I may remind you, Canon, that the author of the Shakespearean plays, poems, and sonnets shows over and over again not merely a knowledge of the principles and practice of the law of real property, but also of the common law, and of the criminal law, and a thorough intimacy of the exact letter of the Statute Law. This *fact* you will clearly see if you refer to lawyer Rushton's two books entitled *Shakespeare a Lawyer* and *Shakespeare's Legal Maxims*, where proof incontrovertible is given that the dramatist known as Shakespeare was fairly steeped in the intricacies of the law—"never was incorrect and never at fault," according to Lord Penzance; and Lord Chief Justice Campbell wrote: "Whilst novelists and dramatists are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither demurrer, bill of exception, nor writ of error." Dr. Sidney Lee says in reply to this statement of Lord Campbell: "Legal termino-

logy abounded in *all plays and poems of the period*." *All*, Dr. Lee? Surely not. Who was it, Dr. Lee, that Sir John Davies attacked for "conceits" in his Sonnets "based on legal technicalities," according to your own showing? Was it not Shakespeare! with regard to his "legal phraseology" in Sonnets 26, 87, 134 (you give 124, in error, in your *Life*, p. 107)? Whom else had Davies in his eye when he wrote his "Sonnets" but Shakespeare and "insignificant rhymers like the author of 'Zepheria'"? You say — "Legal terminology abounded in *all plays and poems of the period*." Trot out a few for Baconian edification in addition to those I have mentioned and the *Parthenophil and Parthenope* of Barnabe Barnes. And Barnabe's law is not in the same hemisphere with that of Shakespeare, say in the speech of *Hamlet* commencing "Where be his quiddits now?" An apprentice in a solicitor's office could have written every item of Barnes' law in a few minutes without assistance from Dr. Lee's accommodating "members of the Inns of Court."

That this Sir John Davies, curiously enough, was a friend of Bacon's cannot be denied, and he was certainly "in the know" as to Bacon being a "poet," as it was to Davies that Bacon wrote when Davies accompanied James VI. from Scotland to England on his accession (1603), "so desiring you to be good to *concealed poets;*" and in a list of *poets* who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Stow, in his "Annales" (1615), includes next to each other the names of Sir Francis Bacon and Sir John Davies. What poetry was it that Bacon had written before 1603 (when he was a "concealed poet") or before 1615 (when he was, according to Stow, one of "our moderne and present excellent poets")? Bacon's only known poetry to 1625 (the year of publication) was his much-abused "Translation of Certain Psalms." This is a point worthy of Dr. Sidney

Lee's passion for literary investigation. It has for long been a puzzle to me what was the Bacon poetry alluded to in the two references I have given. The allusion by Bacon to "concealed poets" Spedding, Bacon's greatest biographer, says: "I cannot explain." Can Dr. Sidney Lee solve the conundrum? He might also inform the Bacon "monomaniacs" and "cranks" what another John Davies (the writing-master of Hereford and of Northumberland House MS. celebrity) means when he addresses Bacon in the following terms:—

> "And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
> As to her Bellamour, the Muse is wont:
> *For thou dost her embosom;* and, dost *keep*
> *Her company for sport 'twixt grave affairs,*
> So utterest law the livelyer, through *thy Muse:*
> And for that *all thy notes are sweetest aires.*"

This was written in 1610 or 1611—long before the Psalm translations were published.

How did Bacon "embosom" "the Muse"? and how did he "keep the Muse's company *for sport* 'twixt great affairs?" I ask Dr. Lee. Unless Bacon was "a poet"—"concealed," perhaps—what is the meaning of these enigmatical lines in John Davies' "Wittes Pilgrimage"? What was the "sport?" And what was the practical outcome of Bacon's companionship with the Muse? The Shakespearean plays, poems, and sonnets?

If Bacon was not a poet how did Waller come to speak of him and Sidney as "nightingales who sang only in the spring?" And if he was not a poet how comes he to confess that he once indited a sonnet to Queen Elizabeth on behalf of Essex? Could this be one of the "Shakespeare" Sonnets, many of which fit into the position of Essex, when out of favour with the Queen?

But this is a digression from "Mark Twain," whose seventh chapter is one of surpassing interest—to me it is—and begins:—

"If I had under my superintendence a controversy appointed to decide whether Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare or not, I believe I would place before the debaters only the one question, *Was Shakespeare ever a practising lawyer?* and leave everything else out.

"It is maintained that the man who wrote the plays was not merely myriad-minded, but also myriad-accomplished; that he not only knew some thousands of things about human life in all its shades and grades, and about the hundred arts and trades and crafts and professions which men busy themselves in, but that he could *talk* about the men and their grades and trades accurately, making no mistakes. Maybe it is so, but have the experts spoken, or is it only Tom, Dick, and Harry? Does the exhibit stand upon wide, and loose, and eloquent generalizing—which is not evidence, and not proof—or upon details, particulars, statistics, illustrations, demonstrations?

"Experts of unchallengeable authority have testified definitely as to the only one of Shakespeare's multifarious craft-equipments, so far as my recollections of Shakespeare-Bacon talk abide with me—his law-equipment. I do not remember that Wellington or Napoleon ever examined Shakespeare's battles and sieges and strategies, and then decided and established for good and all, that they were militarily flawless; I do not remember that any Nelson or Drake or Cook ever examined his seamanship and said it showed profound and accurate familiarity with that art; I don't remember that any king or prince or duke has ever testified that Shakespeare was letter-perfect in his handling of royal court-manners and the talk and manners of aristocracies; I don't remember that any illustrious Latinist or Grecian or Frenchman or Spaniard or Italian has proclaimed him a past-master in those languages; I don't remember—well, I don't remember that there is *testimony*—great testimony—imposing testimony—unanswerable and unattackable testimony as to any of Shakespeare's hundred specialities, except one—the law.

"Other things change, with time, and the student cannot trace back with certainty the changes that various trades and their processes and technicalities have undergone in the long stretch of a century or two and find out what their processes and technicalities were in those early days, but with the law it is different; it is mile-stoned and documented all the way back; and the master of that wonderful trade, that complex and

intricate trade, that awe-compelling trade, has competent ways of knowing whether Shakespeare-law is good law or not; and whether his law-court procedure is correct or not, and whether his legal shop-talk is the shop-talk of a veteran practitioner or only a machine-made counterfeit of it gathered from books and from occasional loiterings in Westminster.

"And so, as I have already remarked, if I were required to superintend a Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, I would narrow the matter down to a single question—the only one, so far as the previous controversies have informed me, concerning which illustrious experts of unimpeachable competency have testified: *Was the author of Shakespeare's Works a lawyer?*—a lawyer deeply read and of limitless experience? I would put aside the guesses and surmises, and perhapses, and might-have-beens, and could-have-beens, and must-have-beens, and we are justified-in-presumings, and the rest of those vague spectres and shadows and indefinitenesses, and stand or fall, win or loose, by the verdict rendered by the jury upon that single question. If the verdict was Yes, I should feel quite convinced that the Stratford Shakespeare, the actor, manager, and trader, who died so obscure, so forgotten, so destitute of even village consequence that sixty years afterwards no fellow-citizen and friend of his later days remembered to tell anything about him, did not write the Works.

"Chapter XIII. of 'The Shakespeare Problem Restated' bears the heading 'Shakespeare as a Lawyer,' and comprises some fifty pages of expert testimony, with comments thereon, and I will copy the first nine, as being sufficient all by themselves, as it seems to me, to settle the question which I have conceived to be the master-key to the Shakespeare-Bacon puzzle."

Then follows part of Mr. Greenwood's admirable Chapter XIII. of "The Shakespeare Problem Restated."

Later on, Mark descants on the Bacon possibilities. Here are a few:—

"When we read the praises bestowed by Lord Penzance and the other illustrious experts upon the legal condition and legal aptnesses, brilliancies, profundities and felicities so prodigally displayed in the plays, and try to fit them to the historyless Stratford stage-manager, they sound wild, strange, incredible, ludicrous; but when we put them in the mouth of Bacon they

do not sound strange, they seem in their natural and rightful place, they seem at home there. Please turn back and read them again. Attributed to Shakespeare of Stratford they are meaningless, they are inebriate extravagancies—intemperate admirations of the dark side of the moon, so to speak; attributed to Bacon, they are admirations of the golden glories of the moon's front side, the moon at the full—and not intemperate, not overwrought, but sane and right, and justified. 'At every turn and point at which the author required a metaphor, simile or illustration, his mind ever turned *first* to the law; he seems almost to have *thought* in legal phrases; the commonest legal phrases, the commonest of legal expressions were ever at the end of his pen.' That could happen to no one but a person whose *trade* was the law; it could not happen to a dabbler in it. Veteran mariners fill their conversation with sailor-phrases and draw all their similes from the ship and the sea and the storm, but no mere *passenger* ever does it, be he of Stratford or elsewhere; or could do it with anything resembling accuracy, if he were hardy enough to try. Please read again what Lord Campbell and the other great authorities have said about Bacon when they thought they were saying it about Shakespeare of Stratford. . . .

"I haven't any idea that Shakespeare will have to vacate his pedestal this side of the year 2209. Disbelief in him cannot come swiftly. Disbelief in a healthy and deeply-loved tar baby has never been known to disintegrate swiftly; it is a very slow process. It took several thousand years to convince our fine race—including every splendid intellect in it—that there is no such thing as a witch; it has taken several thousand years to convince that same fine race—including every splendid intellect in it—that there is no such person as Satan; it has taken several centuries to remove perdition from the Protestant Church's programme of post mortem entertainments; it has taken a weary long time to persuade American Presbyterians to give up infant damnation, and try to bear it as best they can; and it looks as if their Scotch brethren will still be burning babies in the everlasting fires when Shakespeare comes down from his perch.

"We are the reasoning race. We can't prove it by the above examples, and we can't prove it by the miraculous 'histories' built by those Stratfordolaters out of a hatful of rags and a barrel of sawdust, but there is plenty of other things we can prove it by, if I could think of them. We are the reasoning race, and when we find a vague file of chipmunk-tracks string-

ing through the dust of Stratford village, we know by our reasoning powers that Hercules has been along there. I feel that our fetish is safe for three centuries yet. The bust, too, there in the Stratford church. The precious bust, the priceless bust, the calm bust, the serene bust, the emotionless bust, with the dandy moustache and the putty face, unseamed of care—that face which has looked passionlessly down upon the awed pilgrim for a hundred and fifty years, and will still look down upon the awed pilgrim three hundred more, with the deep, deep, deep, subtle, subtle, subtle expression of a bladder. . . .

"Isn't it odd, when you think of it—that you may list all the celebrated Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen of modern times clear back to the first Tudors—a list containing five hundred names, shall we say?—and you can go to the histories, biographies, and cyclopædias and learn the particulars of the lives of every one of them? Every one of them, except one—the most famous, the most renowned—by far the most illustrious of them all—Shakespeare! You can get the details of the lives of all the celebrated ecclesiastics in the list—all the celebrated tragedians, comedians, singers, dancers, orators, judges, lawyers, poets, dramatists, historians, biographers, editors, inventors, reformers, statesmen, generals, admirals, discoverers, prize fighters, murderers, pirates, conspirators, horse jockeys, bunco steerers, misers, swindlers, explorers, adventurers by land and sea, bankers, financiers, astronomers, naturalists, claimants, impostors, chemists, biologists, geologists, philologists, college presidents and professors, architects, engineers, painters, sculptors, politicians, agitators, rebels, revolutionists, patriots, demagogues, clowns, cooks, freaks, philosophers, burglars, highwaymen, journalists, physicians, surgeons—you can get the life histories of all of them but one. Just one—the most extraordinary and the most celebrated of them all—Shakespeare!

"You may add to the list the thousand celebrated persons furnished by the rest of Christendom in the past four centuries, and you can find out the life histories of all those people too. You will then have listed 1,500 celebrities, and you can trace the authentic life histories of the whole of them. Save one—far and away the most colossal prodigy of the entire accumulation—Shakespeare! About him you can find out *nothing*. Nothing of even the slightest importance. Nothing worth the trouble of stowing away in your memory. Nothing that even remotely indicates that he was ever anything more than a distinctly com-

monplace person—a manager, an actor of inferior grade, a small trader in a small village that did not regard him as a person of any consequence, and had forgotten all about him before he was fairly cold in his grave. We can go to the records and find out the life history of every renowned *racehorse* of modern times —but not Shakespeare's! There are many reasons why, and they have been furnished in cartloads (of guess and conjecture) by those troglodytes; but there is one that is worth all the rest of the reasons put together, and is abundantly sufficient all by itself—*he hadn't any history to record.* There is no way of getting around that deadly fact. And no sane way has yet been discovered of getting around its formidable significance.

"Its quite plain significance to any but those Thugs (I do not use the term unkindly) is that Shakespeare had no prominence while he lived, and none until he had been dead two or three generations. The plays enjoyed high fame from the beginning, and if he wrote them it seems a pity the world did not find it out. He ought to have explained that he was the author, and not merely a *nom de plume* for another man to hide behind. If he had been less intemperately solicitous about his bones, and more solicitous about his works, it would have been better for his good name and a kindness to us. The bones were not important. They will moulder away, they will turn to dust, but the works will endure until the last sun goes down."

And then comes the familiar signature, "Mark Twain."

"Mark Twain" is to be congratulated on his racy contribution to the cause which the Baconians have so much at heart, and to which, I am certain, his latest effort will attract many converts. It deserves an answer of one kind or another (or both) from Dr. Sidney Lee, Canon Beeching, Judge Willis, and other worshippers at the shrine of Stratford. We shall wait anxiously till—we get it. Argument or explanation is not in their line, however. They are prepared, with Bishop Phillips Brooks, to declare: "If Bacon should rise from the dead and claim to be the author of the plays I would not believe him."

George Stronach.

SUFFLIMANDUS ERAT.

"He was (indeed) honest and of an open free nature; had an excellent phantasie, brave notions and gentle expressions; wherein he flowed with that facility, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopped."—BEN JONSON, *Discoveries.*

THE moderate Baconian led on excellent general grounds to a firm belief that Francis Bacon wrote the "Shakespeare" plays and poems, has always held fast to the prevailing first view as to who Bacon was and why he wrote plays. This first view is that Francis was a genius by heredity, the son of the learned Sir Nicholas Bacon and the no less learned Lady Anne. Further, that on Sir Nicholas accidentally failing to provide for him out of his great riches, Francis had to make his livelihood by his profession of a lawyer or by literary effort; that he wrote the plays to earn the £6 13s. 4d. apiece usually paid for them, and concealed his authorship because it was not respectable to be associated with actor folk.

These premises happen to have been entirely wrong and misleading, but in the "accesses and notions" of the minds of many resolute Baconians they are so "deeply rooted and branded in" that it is practically impossible to bring some holders to tolerate discussion of the subject in the light of new facts and discoveries. They do not understand that Francis during Elizabeth's time never earned any money at the bar from private litigants, except by her permission, in the year 1594, and that he abandoned this private practice the following year. They also overlook that Francis expended more money in a year than all the "Shakespeare" plays performed in Elizabeth's time could have earned for him. In fact, not knowing their subject biographically, they are irritated with the procession of anagrams, acrostics, ciphers, pagination problems, and the argu-

ments and researches following thereupon, and eventually yield to a desire to say something unpleasant to somebody. I am not, therefore, surprised at Mr. Basil Brown's April article, though it lacks the distinguished courtesies of the criticisms of the late Mr. Bompas and of Mr. Stronach, M.A.

He charges that I am deliberately engaged in mangling Bacon's name and fame, staining him with bastardy, robbing him of his parents, and generally fabricating a fictitious Bacon.

Holding this opinion Mr. Brown, like old Ben Jonson, has argued: "*Sufflimandus Erat.* Woodward and others must be stopped."

Some remarks recently addressed to the College of France by M. Loisy, concerning a different field of research, may serve to indicate my position and probably that of others also in this matter: "So far as it rests with me, all the new facts that are acquired . . . . all the new discoveries that concern it, all real progress in its methods will have here their echo; in that way we shall be able to elucidate our researches and to strengthen our conclusions. *And* we shall have no concern other than concern for the truth."

In the course of Mr. Brown's rhapsody he alleges that the only authority for my statement is an "*invented*" cipher story. This assertion is untrue in substance and in fact.

The cipher story is *not* an invention and is *not* my only authority. Let him read my book, "Tudor Problems," if he doubts this.

Bacon mentions in one of his acknowledged books that he invented the biliteral cipher in 1578. At considerable expense in engraved illustrations in his "De Augmentis," published near the date of the Shakespeare folio, he explained how the cipher was worked. Its use was manifestly for the printed page.

The inference that he put the cipher in practice is very strong.

I have neither the time nor the qualifications to be a decipherer. To decipher, whether it be old texts, cuniform inscriptions, hieroglyphics, or even handwriting, requires such a devotion of time and labour combined with great patience and quickness of perception that few attain the art.

But I am prepared to accept the result of a decipherer's work as honest unless it be proved otherwise.

The decipherer has explained the method of working and has from time to time met all criticisms fairly and intelligently. The differences in the types are there. Casual investigators have found this and I have myself noticed them in one of the 1609 quartos of "Pericles." The story is told in the vernacular of the period. Much of it is writing of the highest poetical quality, far beyond the capacity of any living poet, and the history it reveals is corroborated in quarters which were absolutely shut to the decipherer. The suggestion of fraud or self-delusion on the part of the decipherer is absolutely ridiculous. Yet Mr. Brown alleges that the story is "invented" and that it is my sole authority. Surely this is an impertinence?

With such a fundamental divergence in the main accusation it is not unnatural that I should also question some incidental allegations in Mr. Brown's article. I cannot see how the writer we call "Shakespeare" could in any way be besmirched by the forgeries he refers to. Nor could Bacon's fame, or for that matter any other great man's reputation, be stained by the fact that his parents declined or delayed to submit to the rites of marriage.

Regarding the charge of robbing, the cipher story only corrects a misapprehension which had become general. But if Francis had (like the infant in one of

Mr. Zangwill's tales) the liberty of selecting the parents through whose auspices he should appear on earth I think he might still have chosen Queen Elizabeth and her consort. They were both shrewd, well educated and clever, and the English throne is a great prize. The Earl of Leicester has not been well treated by many historians, but Mr. Brown's unfairness overleaps itself in dubbing him "the assassinator of his wife and the most skilful and secret poisoner of the age of secret murders." I have studied in many books, and at considerable length of time, the circumstances of Amy Robsart's death.

The Queen and Leicester may have compassed it—the age was rough and bloody—may even have endeavoured and possibly succeeded in bringing it about, but a fair view of the facts is equally if not more consistent with the conclusion that Amy committed suicide. The Queen's desperate condition must have been known to or suspected by her, and may have caused her on the 8th September, 1560, to send all her servants away to a local fair while she committed an act of heroic self-sacrifice. All honour to Amy Robsart in either event!

The poisoning charges against Leicester must also belong to the category of "non proven." Leicester was in "great place," and was, therefore, subject to the usual greater share of the calumny of jealous and ignorant persons. Medical knowledge in those days was practically *nil*. It is to the great glory of Francis Bacon that in his many editions of the "Anatomy of Melancholy," and in his acknowledged writings, he did his utmost to prepare a remedy for this deficient.

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton's death was manifestly due to pneumonia. He was an old Puritan friend and the suggestion that Leicester, his host, poisoned him, is as mythical as the charge that he also poisoned Lord Sheffield.

Men in the Elizabethan age died like flies—at one time of a surfeit, at another of a dysentery, or a lung or intestinal trouble, which the vacuous mind at once set down to some secret poison, and not to a natural cause. No; had Leicester been the fiend Mr. Brown alleges, he would not have held the firm friendship of honourable, God-fearing men, such as Henry Sidney, Francis Walsingham, and Thomas Bodley.

Leicester did try his best to help his son to the succession, but the mother's vanity and shame, and her eventual senility, was a block which could not be overcome.

If my moderate Baconian fellow-workers would only free themselves from prepossessions they would be as near the heart of the Baconian mystery as, I think, a few of us are already. Man had to write in parables in those days; the naked truth could not safely be stated, but it could be hinted at. As an instance, see Ben Jonson's poem in honour of Bacon's 60th birthday:—

"And in the midst
Thou standst *as if some mystery thou didst!*"

See how ingeniously Jonson works a double meaning in his last two lines:—

"Give me a deep crowned bowl that I may sing
In *raising* him the wisdom of my *King*."

Very frequently during his life Francis Bacon had to defend the fame of the mother who, nevertheless, on her deathbed, refused to name him as her successor. "I will have no rascal to succeed me; send to Scotland." The gossip at the Queen's death (1603) was countered by his preface to the "Advancement of Learning." A serious renewed attempt to defame her in Paris, in 1607, was promptly met by his Latin pamphlet, "*In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethæ*," which he asked the

English Ambassador to circulate in high places. In 1621, just after his removal from the Woolsack, and when he was ill and expected to die, he made a will in which he expressly directed that this pamphlet should be translated into English, such being, I think, his anxiety that no revived rumours should operate to the prejudice of his late brother Essex's children.

His troubles having practically passed over he made another will, dated 19th December, 1625, by which his purposes were more neatly effected. He gave up the expedient for silencing rumours adopted in his previous will, namely, of directing the Eulogy of Queen Elizabeth to be printed in English (it was not so printed until 1657). Instead, his last will made two clever references to Lady Anne Bacon as his mother, and to Sir Nicholas as his father. Mr. Brown has mentioned the first. The second was accomplished by a direction to his executors to place books of his writings "in the library of Trinity College, where myself was bred, and in the library of Bennet College, *where my father was bred.*" After his death this will was lodged with the probate authorities, when it should, like other wills, have been retained and preserved for reference. But it was removed—and removed, I believe, for a very important reason. It was a document of the utmost State value to the Stuart king as constituting a declaration in writing, although feigned, that Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne were Francis Bacon's father and mother.

Thus was the Stuart king made safe in his succession to the throne, as to which there might otherwise have been trouble afterwards. That there was need of this is shown in the fact that Bacon's nephew Robert, second Earl of Essex, who had been brought up and educated by King James in his own family, and virtually with the honours of a young Prince, and who was afterwards the guest and friend of the King of France, eventually

headed and brilliantly generalled the Parliamentary forces in rebellion against Charles I.

Bacon, close about the date of his last will (1625), wrote and published certain new essays. To that entitled "On Simulation and Dissimulation" attention may usefully be drawn. In some respects it is his Apologiæ. Starting with the proposition "that an habit of secrecy is both politic and moral," he proceeds:—"It followeth many times upon secrecy by a necessity that he that will be secret must be a dissembler in some degree." The great advantages of simulation and dissimulation are, according to the essay, three in number. "First to lay asleep opposition and to surprise. For where a man's intentions are published, it is an alarum to call up all that are against them. The best composition and temperature is to have openness in fame and opinion; secrecy in habit; dissimulation in reasonable use, and a *power to feign if there be no remedy*.

For the disinherited descendants of the last of the Tudors *there was no remedy.* It matters very little whether my views as to the heart of Bacon's mystery find general acceptance in my day or not. Never was a more remarkable romance in real life than that of the two unhappy sons of Queen Elizabeth, the elder of whom developed the greatest intellectual attainments as a poet, philosopher, and statesman, and, when fairly understood, one of the finest of characters that the world has yet known.

Holding these views, and seeking as I have to further Bacon's desire that the true facts about him should be known and fairly judged by his countrymen of a later day, I submit that Mr. Basil Brown's alarm is not warranted, and his accusations not justified.

PARKER WOODWARD.

MACAULAY—BACON'S WORST ENEMY.

IT happened a few weeks ago that I came into possession of a volume published in 1869 by Miss Harriet Martineau, entitled, "Biographical Sketches." It consists of brief estimates of a number of eminent men and women, originally published in the *Daily News* — royal persons, politicians, professional men, clergymen, lawyers, soldiers, scientific men, those talked about in Society, and literary men. There are forty-six such sketches, and among them is one on Macaulay, published soon after his death in 1859. The accomplished lady critic describes Macaulay and the hopes which were centred in him when he first came forward as orator and poet, the most brilliant rhetorician and essayist of his day. Let us briefly reproduce her judgment.

Macaulay was the son of a great philanthropist, Zachary Macaulay, whose name will be remembered in connection with the anti-slavery movement. His son did not inherit his philanthropic qualities. His was a case often noted—sons of pious clergymen becoming men of the world; sons of metaphysicians becoming chemists or geologists; sons of mathematicians becoming artists; sons of statesmen settling in the bush as graziers or cattle breeders. "The child of a philanthropist, Thomas Macaulay *wanted heart*. This was the one deficiency which lowered the value of all his other gifts. . . . He had kindliness, and, for aught we know, good temper, but of the life of the heart he knew nothing." The reaction in his mind from the Clapham school of religionists made him "a conventionalist in morals, an insolent and inconsistent Whig in politics, a shallow and inaccurate historian, a poet pouring out all light and no warmth, and, for an able man, the most unsound reasoner of his time." When

he entered Parliament great were the expectations centred in him. The Administration, when becoming unpopular, was glad to have Macaulay for their spokesman and apologist. "The drawback was his want of accuracy, and especially in the important matter of historical interpretation. If he ventured to illustrate his topic in his own way, by historical analogy, he was immediately checked by some clever antagonist, who, three times out of four, showed that he had mis-read his authorities, or more frequently, had left out some essential point whose omission vitiated the whole statement in question." In 1834 he went to India "as a member of the Supreme Council to frame a code of laws for India. . . . The story of that unhappy code is well known. It is usually spoken of by Whig leaders as merely shelved, and ready for reproduction at some time of leisure. But the fact is there is scarcely a definition that will stand the examination of a lawyer or a layman for an instant, and scarcely a description or provision through which a coach and horses may not be driven. All hope of Macaulay as a lawyer, and also as a philosopher, was over for any who had seen his code." This time, after his return from India, was the time of his greatest brilliancy in private life. His marvellous table-talk, and his brilliant essays in the *Edinburgh Review*, made him intensely popular, and his "History of England" was eagerly expected. But as an historian, apart from his epigrammatic style, his value was speedily discounted. "The critical impeachments which followed must have keenly annoyed him, as they would any man who cared for his honour as a relater of facts, and a reporter and judge of the characters of dead and defenceless men." "There was sure preparation for his failure, as well as success, as an historian, after his article on Bacon in the *Edinburgh*. That essay disabused the wisest who expected services of the

first order from Macaulay. In that article he not only betrayed his incapacity for philosophy, and his radical ignorance of the subject he undertook to treat, but laid himself open to the charge of helping himself to the very materials he was disparaging, and giving as his own large excerpts from Mr. Montagu while loading him with contempt and rebuke."

These are the most significant parts of Miss Martineau's sketch, and Baconians will be glad to find their own resentment against Macaulay's treatment of Bacon more than justified by such an accomplished literary critic.

The current number of the *Quarterly Review* gives other illustrations of Macaulay's literary rancour and asperity, in his warfare against the Right Hon. John Wilson Croker, a regular contributor to the *Quarterly*. The cause of offence is thus described: "Croker had repeatedly countered him on the floor of the House, and on one occasion in particular, during the debates of 1832, with marked success. This was more than Macaulay could stand. Knowing that Croker was about to publish his edition of 'Boswell's Johnson,' Macaulay wrote in his diary: 'That impudent, leering Croker congratulated the House on the proof I had given of my readiness. See whether I do not dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the Blue and Yellow. I detest him more than cold boiled veal.'

"He was as good as his word. Two months later the *Review* appeared, and Croker's jacket was thoroughly dusted. In a letter to his sister dated Sept. 9, 1831, Macaulay writes: 'I have, though I say it who should not say it, beaten Croker black and blue.' He should have been ashamed to say it. What are we to think of a review written in that spirit?"

Mr. Gladstone remarks on this episode :—

"He never mentions Croker except with an aversion which may be partially understood, and also with a contempt which it is not easy to account for. . . . It is yet more to be lamented that in this instance he carried the passions of politics into the Elysian fields of literature, and that the scales in which he tried the merits of Croker's edition of 'Boswell' seem to have been weighted on the descending side with his recollections of Parliamentary collision." Other references to Mr. Gladstone's article on Macaulay are contained in the first number of the "Bacon Journal," p. 18. He sums up his judgment with the weighty words:—"The judgments of Macaulay we deem harsh, and his examinations superficial."

Macaulay's inaccuracies brought upon him heavy censure, especially from the admirers of the Quaker founder of Pennsylvania; and the Bishop of Exeter (Bishop Philpotts) published a pamphlet exposing inaccuracies in other matters. In all these cases Macaulay was defeated.

Macaulay was a strange combination of moral opposites, and for a long time his brilliancy as an orator and essayist made the public blind to his moral faults and historical inaccuracies. As a brilliant table-talker my own recollections may be given as confirmatory. When he became Lord Rector of Glasgow University I was one of the committee who supported his candidature, and was invited to breakfast with him at the house of one of the professors. Conversation at one time turned on celebrated diamonds, and Macaulay related many interesting particulars concerning some of the most valuable diamonds possessed by Indian princes. It was a remarkable exhibition of information on a subject not often introduced into books or speeches. After many particulars Macaulay ceased, and it seemed as if his story was completed. One of

the guests, however, asked him, "And what became of the diamond after that?" and then Macaulay resumed his narrative, and continued to pour out fresh facts for a considerable time.

As Baconians we may rejoice that Macaulay is "found out," and that in due time his estimate of Bacon will be more significant as throwing light on his own character and competency, than as a contribution to our judgment of Bacon.

R. M. T.

SHAKESPEARE AN ORATOR.

A SHORT time ago there appeared in the *Westminster Gazette*, under the title of "Cant About Shakespeare," an article from the pen of its able dramatic critic, Mr. E. F. Spence. The writer had taken for his text an opinion expressed in the criticism on the recent production of *Hamlet* at the Lyceum which appeared in the *Daily Mail* to the effect that it was better to have Shakespeare produced under such conditions than not at all. Mr. Spence dissented from this view. He suggested that the first-night audience of the Lyceum Theatre would prefer to have the play of *Hamlet* written up to date by some second-rate dramatist, and suggested Mr. Cecil Raleigh, whose reputation would not, he considered, suffer by having the term second-rate applied to it when put into comparison with Shakespeare. But Mr. Spence admitted that he failed to understand why the audience in the sixpenny gallery and shilling pit, who knew nothing of the philosophy of the play, who could not grasp (who can grasp them?) the motives and impulses which controlled the love passages between Hamlet and Ophelia, who sometimes laughed when the action of the play would have been more appropriately accompanied by

tears, were, notwithstanding, held spellbound during a performance which lasted from 7.30 until after midnight.

Mr. Spence has here raised a question of interest to the Shakespearean student, and one the bearing of which is of no slight importance to the Baconian case.

Mr. G. W. Foote has, in a recent article, fallen foul of the Baconians. One would have expected that his love of truth, and the sacrifices which he has made in what he believed to be her cause, would have led him to, at any rate, extend a courteous hearing to those who, conscientiously holding views differing from an accepted creed, ventured to express their doubts and misgivings. But no. Mr. Foote would extend to dissentients from an old superstitious creed which he had accepted without examination because it had been held by others before him, just the same scornful treatment which the orthodox have extended to him and his friends in respect of other beliefs.

But he makes a point against the authorship of the dramas by Bacon which has some affinity to the point raised by Mr. Spence. A consideration of the subject may bring to light an argument which has hitherto not been found in the Baconian storehouse, but which may prove to be a strong argument from what is termed internal evidence.

This is Mr. Foote's contention :—

> Bacon was a master of English, though nothing like the master that Shakespeare was. Mark Twain may easily satisfy himself of a peculiar difference between them. Bacon wrote to the eye—Shakespeare wrote to the ear. Bacon's finest passages cannot be read aloud with ease ; Shakespeare's lines flow freely from the tongue, and cause no difficulty in respiration. No other dramatist is within measurable distance in this respect. And a part of the explanation is that he was an actor himself. He worked in the theatre, wrote for the theatre, and made his for-

tune by the theatre. "But it is not good," said Bacon, "to stay too long in the theatre." And Bacon didn't.

Mr. Foote has stumbled up against a remarkable feature of the Shakespeare writings. But his strong prejudice has blinded him, so that he cannot see its true significance. Can one single actor be named who wrote lines which flow freely from the tongue and cause no difficulty in respiration? That is not the special faculty of the actor, but it is of the orator. Shakespeare's verse and prose have a sweet music of their own which could only have been produced by a consummate orator. It is the gift of intuitively choosing words, which strike the ear with a pleasant sound in which to express thoughts, which constitutes the orator. Without it no man can be an orator. It was this sweet-sounding language which fascinated the Lyceum pit and gallery from half-past seven until after midnight on Mr. Matheson Lang's first performance of *Hamlet*.

Carlyle expressed the opinion that Shakespeare would have done better if he had confined himself to prose. It would be difficult to assent to this view. At the same time, it is undoubtedly the fact that Shakespeare's prose stands alone for originality, purity of style, arrangement of the words, evolution of the sentences, cadences, and harmony. Compare him with those who preceded him or those who came after him, and he will be found in a class by himself. It is impossible to get the full effect of either his prose or his verse unless it be read aloud. One can never tire of hearing it. A celebrated stage manager, of what is termed the old school, used to say that if he had doubts as to what to put on, providing he had one or two actors who could speak the lines, he always selected Shakespeare, because the sound of the words would always hold the audience.

"Bacon wrote to the eye—Shakespeare to the ear"! This could not be the statement of a man who knew Bacon's writings. It is a perfect feast for anyone who delights in oratory to read aloud or hear Bacon read aloud. The Essays are punctuated for declaiming. Let anyone read first Hamlet's advice to the players and then Bacon's "Essay on Despatch." They are both set to the same music. Were these lines not written for the ear?—

> "Hee was borne at Pembroke Castle, and lyeth buried at Westminster, in one of the Statelyest and Daintiest Monuments of Europe, both for the Chappell, and for the Sepulcher. So that hee dwelleth more richly Dead, in the monument of his Tombe, than hee did Alive in Richmond or any of his Palaces. I could wish he did the like, in this Monument of his Fame."

The passage bears the impress of the orator, just as do the passages of Shakespeare's prose. Could any sentences be more completely after the style of Bacon than Jacques' speech:—"I have neither the scholler's melancholy which is emulation, nor the musitian's which is fantasticall, nor the courtier's which is proud, nor the souldier's which is ambitious, nor the lawyer's which is politick, nor the ladies' which is nice, nor the lover's which is all these. But it is a melancholy of my owne, compounded of many samples, extracted from many objects, and indeed, the sundry contemplation of my travells, in which my often rumination wraps me in a most humorous sadness;" or the following from *Henry V.*, Act IV., scene i.:—"Now if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to flye from God. Warre is his beadle. Warre is his vengeance. So that here men are punished for

before-breach of the King's lawes, *in novo*, the King's quarrel. Where they feared the death, they have borne life away, and where they would be safe they perish. Then if they dye unprovided, no more is the King guiltie of their damnation than he was before guiltie of those impieties for the which they are now visited. Every subjects duty is the King's, but every Subjects soul is his own ; " or the soliloquy of Hamlet in Act II. scene ii., which attains the very acme of our language for splendour and majesty ? If the Stratford man was capable of writing those speeches he could not have kept silence. His transcendent power as an orator must have been recognised. Richard Grant White, in his "Memoirs of William Shakespeare," writes (p. cxi.) :—

> Of his eminent countrymen, Rayleigh, Sydney, Spenser, Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, Cohe, Camden, Hooker, Drake, Hobbes, Inigo Jones, Herbert of Cherburg, Laud, Pym, Hampden, Selden, Walton, Wotton and Donne may be properly reckoned as his contemporaries, and yet there is no evidence whatever that he was personally known to either of these men, or to any others of less note among the statesmen, scholars, soldiers and artists of his day, excepting a few of his fellow-craftsmen.

Find the greatest orator of the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries and you have found the author of the Shakespeare Plays. Ben Jonson points him out when he says :—

> There happened in my time one noble speaker who was full of gravity in his speaking. . . . His hearers could not cough or look aside from him without loss. He commanded where he spoke, and had his judges angry and pleased at his will. No man had their affections more in his power. The fear of every man who heard him was lest he should make an end.

That was William Shake-speare.

BACON'S CREATIVE SEAL, SIGN, AND COUNTERSIGN IN THE PLAYS.

"And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, 'Read this, I pray thee:' and he saith, 'I cannot; for it is sealed.'"—Isaiah xxix. 11.

THE seal in Biblical times was considered equivalent to the *signature of the owner*, and, also, as the engraved amulet, or cylinder, when revolving, "impressed various figures, carved, or engraved, upon the plastic clay, so the morning light rolling o'er the earth, previously void of form, through the darkness —brings out to view, hills, valleys," etc. That is to say, Creation was identified with the process of the signature, stamping, or sealing upon clay, or wax of a seal, or die. In the Book of Job, the Lord asks Job—"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" (chap. xxxviii., ver. 4). And, after describing Creation in various ways, exclaims—"*It is turned as clay to the seal, and they stand as a garment*" (ver. 14). Sealing, in ancient times, denoted an inalienable possession; the signet being, also, the type of all that was most precious and inviolable (see Ca. viii. 6; Jeremiah xxii., 24th verse). This comes out in the figurative application: "*Having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His*" (2 Timothy ii. 19). It was finally connected with the idea of security and destination, and was the idea (an image) of *secrecy and postponement of disclosure, as when the words of a roll, more particularly if prophetic, were sealed up for the uninitiated, or profane,* till the time came to publish them. Job exclaims of God: "Which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; *and sealeth up the stars*" (chap. ix., verse 7). The anointing, sealing or crowning of a King, is a strictly religious ceremony,—it confirms the character upon the

King,—he is *sealed* for an office. So likewise Holy Orders confirm character as a stamp or mark (*sigillum*), or *seal* upon priests, "In the express image of His Person" (Hebrews i. 3). In legal matters the seal ratifies, authenticates, and confirms. It is an assurance, or pledge, as sealing unto a bond (see *Merchant of Venice*). And the expression "*to set a seal*" upon a thing signifies it as settled and final. In Ezekiel there is the description of what was a sealed book, "And when I looked, behold, an hand was sent unto me; and, lo, a roll of a book was therein. And he spread it before me; *and it was written within and without*" (chapter ii. 9, 10). There is no allusion to a seal in this passage, but, nevertheless, this esoteric style of writing was Hermetic, that is sealed.

In Bacon's Distribution Preface, (*Distributio Operis*), describing, in a sort of introduction to the "Instauration" and its several parts, he writes :—

"Neque enim, hoc siverit Deus, ut phantasiæ nostræ somnium pro exemplari mundi edamus; sed potius benigne faveat ut Apocalypsim ac veram visionem vestigiorum et sigillorum Creatoris super creaturas scribamus."

("For we do not,—this God forbid,—give, as models of the world, our Dreams of Fancy, but rather that He may benignantly favour us to write the true vision of the *impresses* (*footsteps*), *and seals of the Creator upon His creatures.*")*

This image of the *stamping and impressing, as of a seal upon wax, or clay* (which seems borrowed from Plato), is

* And, God forbid, that ever we should offer the Dreams of Fancy for a model of the world; but rather through the Divine favour, write a Revelation, and real view of the Stamps and Signatures of the Creator upon the creatures (Vol. I., p. 16, Works, Shaw, 1732).

frequently repeated by Bacon, and infects his style to a remarkable degree. In the Essay of "Goodness, and Goodness of Nature," Bacon says:—"The inclination to goodness is *imprinted* deeply in the nature of man"; and in the Two Books of the "Advancement of Learning," he writes:—"For all things *are marked and stamped* with this triple character of the power of God, the difference of nature and the use of man" (Book II. 9). In another passage:—"First the Scriptures, revealing the Will of God, and then the creatures expressing His power; whereof the latter is a key unto the former: not only opening our understanding to conceive the true sense of the Scriptures, by the general notions of reason and rules of speech; but chiefly opening our belief, in drawing us into a due meditation of the omnipotency of God, *which is chiefly signed and engraved upon His works*" (Book I., p. 46).

Again, discussing the relationship of truth and goodness:—"Certain it is that *Veritas* and *Bonitas* differ but *as the seal and the print:* for truth *prints* goodness, and they be the clouds of error which descend in the storms of passions and perturbations" ("Advancement of Learning," Book I. 62).

This idea of *signature* is singularly strong in Bacon's mind. For at the opening of the First Book of the "Advancement of Learning," in his address to King James the First, he declares that the "learning, propriety inherent, and individual attribute in your Majesty, deserveth to be expressed not only in the fame and admiration of the present time, nor in the history or tradition of the ages succeeding, but also in some solid work, fixed memorial, and immortal monument, *bearing a character or signature** both of the power

* In one of Bacon's letters to Sir Tobie Matthew he alludes mysteriously to what he calls his "*Works of the Alphabet.*" The letters of the alphabet are often called *characters,* and as the

of a king and the difference and perfection of such a king" (First Book "Advancement of Learning," pp. 5, 6).

Bacon then proceeds to conclude that he cannot do better than make an oblation of a treatise "*to that end*," so that the "Advancement of Learning" and all it embraces is to stand for this "immortal monument" he refers to. In his description of *Philosophia Prima* he asks, "Are not the organs of the senses of one kind with the organs of reflection, the eye with a glass, the ear with a cave or strait, determined and bounded? Neither are these only similitudes, as men of narrow observation may conceive them to be, *but the same footsteps of nature, treading or printing upon several subjects or matters*" (Book II. "Advancement of Learning," p. 95).

It seems Bacon had some profound apprehensions of evolution, for this passage, if it means anything, signifies that man's organs of the senses have been produced (or evolved) from the operations of the macrocosm working upon the plastic substance of the microcosm; printing, as it were in the organism, the effects of what we perceive on a larger scale, and in general laws at large in nature.

"So is the wisdom of God more admirable, when nature intendeth one thing, and providence draweth forth another, than if He had communicated to particular creatures and motions *the characters and impressions of His providence*" (Second Book of "Advancement of Learning," p. 106).

"The knowledge which respecteth the faculties of the mind of man is of two kinds; the one respecting his understanding and reason, the other, his will,

Drama consists chiefly of *Dramatis Personæ*, or the play of human characters in action, it is highly probable that Bacon used this expression to denote his plays.

appetite, and affection; whereof the former produceth position or decree, the latter action or execution. It is true that the imagination is an agent or *nuncius*, in both provinces, both the judicial and the ministerial. For sense sendeth over to imagination before reason have judged: and reason sendeth over to imagination before the decree can be acted. For imagination ever proceedeth voluntary motion. Saving that this *Janus* of imagination hath differing faces. For the face towards reason hath the *print of truth*, but the face towards action hath the *print of good*, which nevertheless are faces,—*Quales decet esse sororum*" (2nd Book, 130).

Bacon's doctrines of forms is closely bound up with his metaphor of stamping, or sealing. It is striking to find that what he writes upon the subject agrees with a text we are about to quote from *The Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ellis and Spedding, in a footnote, remark upon the *Form*:—"Bacon applies it to the *form* considered as the *causa immanens* of the properties of the body." And in the Third Aphorism of the Second Book of the *Novum Organum*, Bacon says:—"From the discovery of *Forms* therefore results truth in speculation, and freedom in operation." . . . "It is safer to begin and raise the sciences from those foundations which have relation to practice and to let the active part itself be *as the seal which prints and determines the contemplative counterpart.*"—(Bk. II., Aph. IV.).

Action is a name by which the Drama is generally understood, and if by *Active* we understand (in this passage) the Creator Dramatist, and by the *Contemplative* that which is to be interpreted, or understood, then this act of sealing and printing is simply suggestive of the poet's art.

In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Theseus, addressing Hermia, exclaims:—

"What say you, Hermia? Be advised, fair maid:

To you your father should be *as a God;*
One that composed your beauties,° *yea, and one*
To whom you are but as a form in wax
By him imprinted and within his power
To leave the figure or disfigure it."
(Act I., sc. i. 45).

Observe how closely this excerpt resembles the passage already quoted in Latin (from Bacon's Distribution Preface) at the commencement of this article. "For we do not,—this God forbid give *the fantasies of our sleep* as examples of the world; but rather that He should benignantly favour us to write the Apocalypse and *true vision of the footsteps and seals of the Creator upon His creatures*."

We have here two marked allusions to *dream and vision*, and, for my part, I believe that Bacon, when he wrote this passage, was thinking of *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, which so exactly answers to the description—"*phantasiæ nostræ somnium*"—for it is completely a poetical fantasy presented, under the title, and in the form, of *the chiaroscuro of a vision of the night!* The poet derives his name from his Creator,—because in his faculty of creation he comes nearest, as a matter, or Ποιητης, to the Divine image, and particularly so in dramatic composition. The philosophy, which properly belongs to this parallelism, is Plato's, who uses this expression of *seal and wax* to illustrate it. This play of the Dream strikingly resembles the *Comedy of Errors* in the cross purposes, confusions and mistakings of the two pairs of lovers in each play, who are grouped and linked

° Bacon writes:—"It is so then, that in the work of the creation we see a double emanation of virtue from God; the one referring more properly to power, the other to wisdom; the one expressed in making the subsistence of the matter, *and the other in disposing the beauty of the form*" (1st Book "Advancement of Learning," p. 41).

together after the same fashion of error. In the Dream we seem to have *the nightside of nature* presented to us. And as Bacon declares that the *light of nature* is insufficient for the acquisition of truth (because it only answers to the senses and second causes), so in this play we seem to have a picture of *the refracted and reflected light*, by which, according to Bacon's philosophy, man beholds nature and himself. (See Two Books of "Advancement of Learning.")

In the second book of the Two Books of the "Advancement of Learning" (1605), Bacon says:— "The invention of Forms is of all other parts of Knowledge the worthiest to be sought if it be possible to be found. But it is manifest that Plato, *in his opinion of ideas*, as one that had a wit of elevation situate as upon a cliff, did descry that *Forms were the true object of Knowledge*. For as to the forms of substances (man only except, of whom it is said: 'Formavit hominem de limo terræ, et spiravit in facum ejus spiraculum vitæ'), etc." (Page 102) And upon the next page Bacon calls Forms, "*essences upheld by matter*." The name *Hermia* holds a close affinity, to the subject of this article. For we use the expression, "*Hermetic Art*," *and* "*hermetically sealed*" to indicate occult, and closely hidden, or guarded secrets, that contain essence in one *form* or other,—and are as the spirit to the letter, in respect of seal and print.

Bacon's allusion to Plato, and his doctrine of Forms, quoted above, recalls Aristotle's saying of Plato's works:—describing them "as *published and not published*," that is to say, they were written in an esoteric style "that must choose its reader," and in such a way as to exclude exoteric discovery.

Bacon applied the principal of forms to Induction itself. He says in the "Advancement of Learning:— "But the greatest change I introduce is in the *form itself* of Induction which shall *analyse experiences*."

"Whosoever knoweth any form knoweth the utmost possibility of *superinducing that nature upon any variety of matter*" *(Ib.)*.

This would be equally true of *poetic* form in the sense it is applied to Hermia by her father, who compares himself to a God, and says "one that *composed your beauties*," suggesting *poetic composition*,* always considered more or less divine and hence the Greek for poet means a God, or Maker,

> "For of the soul, the body form doth take
> For soul is form, and doth the body make."

Bacon says "To descend from spirits and intellectual *forms* to sensible and material *forms*, we read, the first *form* that was created was light" (1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 41). This is important because it proves Bacon conceived *two distinct classes of forms*, the latter sensible the former intellectual. And this is confirmed by this passage upon truth:—"For the third vice or disease of learning which concerneth deceit, or untruth, it is of all the rest the foulest; as that which doth destroy *the essential form of knowledge*, which is nothing but a representation of truth" (1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 31). Again he observes:—"In the same manner to inquire the *form* of a lion, of an oak, of gold, nay of water, of air, is a vain pursuit. But to inquire the *form* of sense, of voluntary motion, of vegetation, of colours, of gravity, of levity, of density, of tenuity, of heat, of cold, and all other natures

* Hamlet, in his instructions to the players, exclaims:—"The purpose of playing, whose end both at the first and now was and is to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time, *his form and pressure*" (Act II. ii.).

The connotation of these two words, in italics, is striking. The author is thinking of the pressure of a form in a seal, or die, and thus of dramatic creation.

and qualities, which like an alphabet are not many, and of *which the essences* (*upheld by matter*) *of all creatures do consist*, to inquire, I say, the true *form* of these is that part of metaphysic which we now define of" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 103). Bacon's intellectual *form* is very clearly the essence, or essential idea of a thing, and in the case of Hermia, the wax may be considered as the efficient, or in Bacon's own words "*vehiculum formæ*," the vehicle of the *form*, that is to say, its material expression and qualities.

"The use of human reason in religion is of two sorts. In the former we see God vouchsafeth to descend to our capacity in the expression of His mysteries in sort as may be sensible unto us; and doth graft His revelations and holy doctrine upon the notions of our reason, and applieth His inspiration to open our understanding, *as the form of the key to the ward of the lock*" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 223). So that the discovery of Bacon's forms would be to discover the key to the unlocking of the Instauration.

The employment of the word *stamp'd* to denote congenital character is common in the plays. Richard III. exclaims:—

> "I that am rudely *stamped*, and want love's majesty."
> (*Richard III.* I. i. 16),

> "That most venerable man which I
> Did call my father, was I know not where
> When I was *stamped*."
> (*Cymbeline* II. v. 5)

> "Nay, he is your brother by the surer side,
> Although my seal be stamped in his face."
> (*Titus Andronicus* IV. ii. 127).

In the second book of the Two books of the "Advancement of Learning," Bacon observes of Our Saviour:—

"For we read not that ever He vouchsafed to do any miracle about honour or money (*except that one for giving tribute to Cæsar*), but only about the preserving, sustaining, and healing the body of man."—(page 121, T. Case). This allusion is to the episode when Christ was brought a piece of silver at His request (in reply to whether it was lawful to pay tribute unto Cæsar), and He answered, "Whose image and superscription is this?" "And they replied Cæsar's." When he exclaimed, "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*" In the question of the real authorship of the plays, attributed to Shakespeare, *it is just this image and superscription, and to whom it belongs*, that lies at the bottom of the entire problem. And it is not a little remarkable that this very same simile of coin, or of impression of a stamp, die, or seal, is repeatedly employed by Bacon to represent the Divine act of Creation upon the creatures, and is to be refound in the plays likewise. Sometimes Bacon used the word "*impressed*," sometimes the word "*stamped*," and sometimes "*engraven*," but always with the same signification of ideas, character, or form, applied to Creation real, or poetic, as spirit and letter, soul and body. For example, "This double nature of good, and the comparative thereof, is much more *engraven* upon man if he degenerate not" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," p. 166). In another passage:—"There is *impressed* upon all things a triple desire or appetite proceeding from love to themselves;—one of preserving and continuing their form;—another of advancing and perfecting their form;—and a third of multiplying and extending their form upon other things; whereof *the multiplying or signature of it upon other things*, is that which we handled by the name of active good" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," 1605, page 171). Discussing "the several characters of natures and dispositions," Bacon says:—

"Of much like kind are those *impressions of nature*, which are imposed upon the mind by the sex, by the age, by the region, by health and sickness, by beauty and deformity, and the like, which are inherent and not extern" (*Ib.* 181).

A man's style in writing bears a certain *stamp, or signature* belonging particularly to himself, which is the outcome of two things—the substance of the writing, and the words and sentences by which they are expressed.

In the plays we find exactly the same image, the same use, and the same words employed to enforce this simile of *the seal and its print*, and applied to creation. Compare :—

> "It is the show and *seal* of nature's truth,
> Where love's strong passion is *impressed* in youth."
> (*All's Well that Ends Well*, Act. I., iii., 138).

In *Titus Andronicus*, Aaron's child is described :—

> "The Empress sends it thee, *thy stamp, thy seal.*"
> (Act IV. ii).

And in *Cymbeline*, Guiderius is described :—

> "This is he, who hath upon him still
> *That natural stamp.*" (Act V. v. 366).

In *Measure for Measure*;—describing illegitimate procreation :—

> "Do coin heaven *in stamps* that are forbid."
> (Act II. iv. 46).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Let there be some more test made of my metal
> Before so noble and so great a figure
> Be *stamped* upon it." (Act I. i. 51).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Nay, he is your brother by the surer side
> *Although my seal be stamped in his face.*"
> *Titus Andronicus*, IV. ii. 127).

Speaking of the Schoolmen, Bacon says,—"Who were generally of the contrary part, and whose writings were in a different style and form; taking liberty *to coin and frame* new terms of art" ("Vanities of Studies," 1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," p. 27). "For herein the invention of one of the late poets is proper, and doth well enrich the ancient fiction. For he feigneth that at the end of the thread or web of every man's life there was a little medal containing the persons name, and that Time waited upon the shears, and as soon as the thread was cut, caught the medals and carried them to the river of Lethe; and about the banks there were many birds flying up and down, that would get the medals and carry them in their beaks a little while." In the dedicatory epistle to the first edition of the Essays, Bacon describes this work in these words:—"Only I disliked now to put them out, because they will be like the late *new half pence, which though the silver were good, yet the pieces were small*" (30th January, 1597).

This simile of creation as moulded by a die, *seal, or stamp*, is no occasional chance image, but always introduced in the plays to illustrate natural processes and congenital human character. Hamlet exclaims of evil men:—"These men, carrying, I say, the *stamp* of one defect" (I. iv. 31).

. . . . . .

"To cozen fortune, and be honourable
Without the *stamp* of merit."
(*Merchant of Venice* II. ix.).

. . . . . .

"For use can almost change the *stamp* of nature."
(*Hamlet* III. iv. 168).

"Thou elvish-mark'd, abortive, rooting hog!
Thou that wast *sealed* in thy nativity
The slave of nature and the son of hell!"
(*Richard III.* I. iii.).

In the *Novum Organum* Bacon observes:—"But I say

that those foolish and *apish images* of worlds which the fancies of men have created in philosophical systems, must be utterly scattered to the winds. Be it known then how vast a difference there is (as I said before) between the idols of the human mind, and the Ideas of the Divine. The former are nothing more than arbitrary abstractions; *the latter are the Creator's own stamp upon Creation, impressed and defined in matter by true and exquisite lines*" (Book I. "Aph." CXXIV.). It will be observed that this passage strongly parallels the already quoted extract from the Distribution Preface. The "apish images" recall the context, where man is compared to an angry ape in *Measure for Measure*, and is told he is "most ignorant of what he is most assured." We commonly speak of a writer's *stamp or style*,—surely it never was more clearly revealed in the plays than by this repeated image of Bacon's, used, in spite of the disguised language, to illustrate creation poetic and dramatic as well as Divine?

In the *Novum Organum* Bacon observes:—"There is a great difference between the idols of the human mind and the ideas of the Divine. That is to say, between certain empty dogmas, *and the true signatures and marks set upon the works of creation as they are found in nature*" (Book I., "Aphorism" XXIII.).

In the Sonnets is to be found just the same image of the *seal, and unmistakably applied directly to the poet himself by himself!*

SONNETS II.[o]

"Let those, whom Nature hath not made for store,
Harsh, featureless, and rude, barrenly perish.
Look, whom she best endowed, she gave thee more,
Which bounteous gift thou shouldst in bounty cherish.
She carved thee for her seal, and meant thereby,
Thou shouldst print more, nor let that copy die."

In the poem of *Venus and Adonis*:—

[o] See Sonnets 84, 37; 67, 14.

"Pure lips, sweet seals in my soft lips imprinted,
What bargains may I make, still to be sealing?
To sell myself I can be well contented,
So thou wilt buy, and pay, and use good dealing.
Which purchase if thou make, for fear of *slips*,
Set thy seal-manual on my wax-red lips."

"*Slips*" were counterfeit coins, made of brass, washed over with silver, and are frequently alluded to in the plays of this period. From this extract, and the image of the "*seal manual*," which is a legal instrument, it is plain that the poet author very early attached great importance to this metaphor as evidence of truth and signature.

The Italians have a saying, borrowed from the "Orlando Furioso of Ariosto," to express any very extraordinary man, or artist, and in the expresson of it use this same image of the mould, or stamp :—"*Natura il fece e poi ruppe la stampa*,"—"Nature made him and afterwards broke the mould," that is to say, Nature formed but one such man,—which, without exaggeration, will, no doubt, be repeated throughout all time in praise of Bacon. "*Quæris Alcidæ parem?*" ("Do you seek the equal of Hercules?") Seneca asks (in his "Hercules Furens"), and the reply is :—"*Nemo est nisi ipse*" ("There is none except it be himself).

Sowing with the basket. Shall he not reap this this heavenly dower for posterity? Yes! he shall, as Lowell says :—

"Reap such harvests as all master spirits
Reap, haply not on earth, but reap no less
Because his sheaves are bound by other hands
Than his."

Aristophanes tells how Herakles crossed the Styx to bring back to Athens one of the great dramatic poets. But this was not to complete the incomplete, but to save Athens from her troubles. And, in like manner, if

we could recall Bacon, we might at once, and for ever, put to rest these perplexing questions of authorship. But it is only the learning of Herakles that can accomplish this task, and where are we to find this learning except in the works of Bacon himself? Lessing remarked: "What they used to say of Homer, that it was easier to rob Hercules of his club than him of a line, you can say with perfect truth of Shakespeare. On the least of his beauties is *stamped a seal*, which at once proclaims to the whole world, 'I am Shakespeare.'" That stamp, signature, and seal is no mere metaphor, or poetical image, for it is the very simile Bacon employs to represent Creation and human congenital character, just as we refind it expressed, with the same words, in the plays. It can therefore be rightly called a *câchet*, and the mark of a covenant, or sacrament. Bacon observes: "For the liturgy or service, it consisteth of the reciprocal acts between God and man; which, on the part of God, are the preaching of the Word, and the sacrament, which are *seals to the Covenant*" (End of second book *Advancement of Learning*, 1605). In the *Rape of Lucreece*, sealing is not only connected with creation, but introduced as the act, or authorship, of imprinting.

> "For men have marble, women waxen minds,
> And therefore are they formed as marble will;
> The weak oppressed, the impression of strange kinds
> Is formed in them by force, by fraud, or skill:
> *Then call them not the authors of their ill,*
> *No more than wax shall be accounted evil,*
> *Wherein is stamped the semblance of a devil.*" *

* The meaning is a little obscure. The minds of women being wax, are susceptible of any impression the harder marble may choose to make upon them:—

> How easy is it for the proper false
> In women's waxen hearts to set their forms!
> (*Twelfth Night*, II. ii.).

To set a seal upon a thing, is a metaphorical expression signifying that it is confirmed, established and settled, and, in the above passage, *stamping is implied as authorship* (which simile applies equally to poetic creation) and Bacon had this fixed in his mind very early in his poetic career.

Sometimes this image takes the form of printing, as when Leontes exclaims to Florizel:

> "Your mother was most true to wedlock prince;
> For she did *print* your royal father off,
> Conceiving you." (*Winter's Tale*, V. i.).

And Paulina, when presenting the babe Perdita to its father, says—

> "Behold my Lords,
> Although the *print* be little, the whole matter
> And copy of the father, eye, nose, lip,
> The trick of's frown, his forehead, nay, the valley,
> The pretty dimples of his chin and cheek,
> His smile." (*Ib.*, Act II. iii.).

In this same play we find an embassy sent to the shrine of Apollo.

> "When the oracle,
> Thus by Apollo's * great divine *seal'd up*,
> Shall the contents discover, something rare
> Even then will rush to knowledge."
> (Act III. i.).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "You here shall swear upon this sword of justice,
> That you, Cleomenes and Dion, have brought
> This seal'd up oracle, by the hand delivered

* In the "*Assizes held at Parnassus by order of Apollo*," published by George Withers, Lord Bacon figures as the *President of the Muses*, a representative Apollo. In his reference to the *Apocalypse*, made in the passage quoted from the Distribution preface (at the commencement of this article) the sealed book mentioned in the fifth chapter of Revelation comes to mind.

Of great Apollo's priest, and that since then
You have not dared to break the holy seal
Nor read the secrets in't." (Act III. ii.).

The seal is always introduced as confirmative and conclusive.

Hamlet: "How in my words soever she be shent
To give them *seals* never, my soul, consent."
(Act III. ii.).

And in *King John* :—

"Oh when the last account 'twixt heaven and earth
Is to be made, then shall this hand and *seal*
Witness against us to damnation."
(Act IV. ii.).

W. F. C. Wigston.

A GREAT BACONIAN DISCOVERY.

MR. E. V. TANNER will shortly publish the results of fifteen years' labour on an arithmetical cipher of Francis Bacon, which he discovered in the lines addressed "To the Reader," placed opposite to the engraving by Martin Droeshout, forming the counterpart to the title-leaf of the 1623 folio edition of Shakespeare's plays.

An inspection of Mr. Tanner's work justifies the opinion that his is the most remarkable discovery of cipher which has yet been made in connection with the printing of those priceless dramas. The cipher is arithmetical and can readily be verified by "the plain man." It points to the fact that Bacon chose the year 1623 for the publication because of the peculiar powers of the figures constituting it.

But this is not all. Mr. Tanner, upon evidence that is almost eerie in its characteristics, but which is both ample and easy of verification, propounds the theory

that Francis Bacon was the re-organiser of Free Masonry. Through that Society, or by some similar means, such control of the printing press of the country was obtained as enabled the manner of spelling certain classes of words to be altered so as to agree in their numerical values.

In order to accomplish his design, Bacon must have prepared tables of proportions on a scale which has never before or since been approached.

The spelling of his mask name, "William Shakespeare," was finally adopted after much consideration and experiment solely on account of the numerical equivalents of the letters of which it is composed.

The book cannot fail to carry conviction. It almost passeth the understanding of man to conceive how Mr. Tanner can have, as it were, entered into the mind of Bacon and reproduced its most subtle workings. This has been accomplished simply by following out in the minutest detail Bacon's method of induction. But the process was so complicated and the reasoning so abstruse, until the results are obtained, that the work of the decipherer appears to be a mental achievement as great or even greater than that of the cryptographer.

REVIEWS.

Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam of Verulam, Viscount of St. Alban, together with some others, all of which are now, for the first time, deciphered and published by William Stone Booth. Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., London, and Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1809, 4to, 631 pages, 25s. net.

THE Author introduces his work in a preface which is replete with sound principles. "It is ungracious," he says, "to destroy a pleasing illusion, and this book is not written with that purpose. It is written solely in the interest of Science—in this case the Science of Biography." After relating by what steps he was brought to examine certain works to see if Bacon could have

signed his name to them he proceeds :—"I confess that I was daunted at the outset of my work by the personal obloquy that has been heaped upon scholar and charlatan alike by the men who are content with the inferential method of writing literary history; but reflecting that life is short and that a little obloquy does not do much harm, I decided to make known these acrostics in the hope that their discovery might lead men to approach the problems of biography in a more scientific spirit." And again, "The man who allows his inferences to crystallise into an orthodox opinion is on the highroad to oblivion, or is courting the ridicule of posterity. Literary history is science. It is a matter of facts. No lasting history can be built on opinion, and no scholarship which is afraid of enquiry can retain respect." In such an admirable spirit does Mr. Booth enter upon his task.

Part I., consisting of five chapters, 89 pages, is introductory and explanatory. Part II. consists of signatures of Francis Bacon and Anthony Bacon which appeared in works originally published anonymously, or over the names of other men; together with a few names which have been found woven into some occasional verse of Elizabethan and Jacobean times; these occupy the remainder of the book. In the case of nearly every acrostic a photographic fac-simile is presented from the earliest known edition of the page to which it refers, with directions as to the manner in which it is to be traced. The introductory chapters are full of interesting information on the subject. Mr. Booth explains that the discovery of the acrostics was the result of study in the cipher codes which were in use by ambassadors, intelligencers, and men who were directly or indirectly in the service of the governments of the last part of the sixteenth and the early years of the seventeenth century. He goes on to say :—

"The student of alphabetical ciphers quickly becomes aware that acrostics and anagrams are close variants of more recondite mathematical arrangements of types or letters to be seen in ciphers. He will be inclined to regard all such uses of letters as sprung from a very ancient habit—that, namely, of using signs to express meaning. The official cryptography of the times of Elizabeth brought into play a very high order of intelligence. To decipher a difficult despatch which had been intercepted, required not only a keenly developed analytical faculty, but often a wide knowledge of languages and mathematics. It would follow, naturally, that a man learned in the art of ciphering would find it easy to make an acrostic or an anagram. His occupation would suggest to him many a trick for hiding his name, if he wished to do so. The art drew into its service chemistry, curious cabalistic mysticism and ingenuity, astrology, mechanics, and as has been remarked above, languages and mathematics. . . . The use in both ways seems to have spread at that time, with the influence of Italian genius throughout the more polite literatures of Europe. Elizabethan literature is liberally strewn with acrostics and anagrams."

The connection of Anthony Bacon and Sir Henry Wotten with the art and practice of cipher-writing is described. They are selected as representatives of the class of men who, occupied in state affairs, were responsibly conversant with that art and practice. Francis Bacon's references to ciphers in the *Advancement of Learning*, 1605, and the *De Augmentis*, 1623, are also referred to in establishing the ground-work for the examples which follow.

Mr. Booth deals at length with the practice of Anonymity and Pseudonymity. He says :—

"The custom of unmistakably declaring one's self the author of literary works has become general only in very recent times." But in lieu thereof the author took "pains to sign his works internally (structurally) in such a way that his authorship could not be denied or forgotten."

The subject is treated at length, and in a very comprehensive manner. The opinions of the Author of *The Arte of English Posie* (than whom "no writer before, or since, has placed the art of the poet on a higher place") are copiously quoted.

Thus Mr. Booth, having established the prevalence of cypher-writing, the general practice of anonymity and pseudonymity, has prepared the way for proclaiming the discoveries to which it is the object of his work to give publicity. The reader is recommended to master thoroughly a chapter on "method" which follows, and to familiarise himself with the practical specimens which lie next to it. The plan for secreting the cipher most frequently adopted is termed a string cipher. In considering the text it is necessary to treat the letters as if they were on a continuous string running from left to right, then right to left, again left to right, and so on irrespective of the correct sequence of the words. The string cipher may be applied to (*a*) initials of words ; (*b*) terminals, *i.e.*, letters beginning and ending a word ; (*c*) terminals of all whole words and part words, *i.e.*, parts divided by a hyphen ; (*d*) all letters in the text ; (*e*) outside letters of a page, or side of a page ; (*g*) capitals. It is essential that each acrostic shall be *keyed* ; that is, that the points of commencement and ending shall either be two adjacent letters or words, or the commencement or ending of a verse or speech, or some two well-defined points between which the acrostic is self-contained. The places said to be naturally chosen for an acrostic signature are : the dedication, the preface, the so-called printer's preface, or address to a patron, or reader ; the first page or the last page. Sometimes one half of the acrostic will run from one corner of the text and the other half from the opposite corner, meeting on the same letter in the middle of the text, and so completing the keying.

But it is impossible, in the limited space here available, to give extracts which would fully or fairly describe the methods by which these acrostics are worked out. Let it suffice to say that there is no hedging or making easy in the conditions. The rules

are laid down at the outset, and in all the examples given in Part I. and in the 251 signatures set out in Part II. there is no waiver of any such rules throughout the work. The first signature is from the dedication to *The Arte of English Poesie*, where, between the R. F. with which it commences and the R. F. found as a signature at the foot, the name Francis Bacon occurs, keying on the first letter of the word "not" in the sentence "it could not scypher her Majesties honour or prerogative." There are other signatures found in the same work, and in the "Partheniades," which were printed in the same volume. Then follow signatures in "Venus and Adonis," "Lucrece," "The Sonnets," "The Passionate Pilgrim," "A Lover's Complaint," poems written by Wil. Shake-Speare, Gent. (1640), "The Phœnix and the Turtle," "Pericles, Prince of Tyre, "Two Noble Kinsmen," "Tamburlaine the Great," "The Famous Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta," "England's Helicon," "Palladis Palatuum," some poems which have appeared under the name of Edmund Spenser, and some prose which has been attributed to Edward Kirke, Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, which have been assigned to the actor William Shakspere. (First Folio Edition). Certain of the Quartos acknowledged by Bacon—My Essays, Religious Meditations, Places of Perswasion and Diswasion, A Translation of Certain Psalmes.

A table in the appendix gives 32 different forms in which the name of Francis Bacon appeared during his lifetime, and in his authorised works issued after his death. Many of these different forms are found in the acrostic signatures discovered.

There is no point of doubt as to the existence of these signatures—the fac-similes are there, and in every case the signatures can be traced therein, the rules laid down by Mr. Brook being strictly adhered to. The question then arises, Are these acrostics accidental? Might not similar arrangements of letters be found in any newspaper or periodical?

The point to be considered is this: It is a problem of *re*currence of a certain form of identifying mark in definite places in a series of works of suspected authorship. It is *not* a problem of *oc*curence of a certain form of mark in *any* place.

The book is one which should be studied closely. It is one of the most remarkable works which have appeared bearing on the authorship of the Shakespeare plays. It certainly contains positive proof that Francis Bacon, either as author—and probably as author—or in some other capacity, was concerned in the publication not only of the Shakespeare poems and plays but of other works the authorship of which has been placed under doubt. The contents of the volume bear evidence of great care in compilation, it is well printed and produced, and the reader will gain much pleasure and instruction from working out the problems which it proposes and explains. Mr. Booth is to be congratulated on his far-reaching discovery, the result of years of patient study and experiment.

The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays. By William Theobald, late Deputy Superintendent of the Geological Survey of India, Member of the Royal Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the Numismatic Society of London. Robert Banks and Son, London, 7s. 6d. net.

THIS erudite volume has been recently published under the superintendence of Dr. J. M. Theobald. It will be dealt with at length in the next number of BACONIANA.

NOTES.

HOW is it that Mr. Sidney Lee displays such lamentable ignorance whenever he mentions Bacon? In that remarkable book, "Letters from the Dead to the Dead," * the author points out one glaring lapse of the distinguished biographer. He says:—

"Mr. Sidney Lee, a renowned writer, who depends in part on his fancy for his facts and thereby has been much bepraised by the unthinking, is authority for the following statement: 'He (Bacon) knew nothing of Napier's discovery of the "Logarithms"' ("Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century," page 248). So far as Mr. Lee is concerned, Napier's letter † states the facts with pitiless accuracy; but *de hors* the record, as one may say, there are extant two books which utterly refute Mr. Lee's placid dictum—(*a*) Napier's 'Logarithms,' 1st Edition, 1614, annotated in Bacon's handwriting; (*b*) Briggs' 'Logarithms,' 1624, wherein Bacon with his own pen has verified some of Briggs' calculations."

In *The Fortnightly Review* for June Mr. Lee has an article on "French Culture and Tudor England," in which he says (p. 1,144):—"Neither Francis Bacon nor

* By Oliver Lector. Bernard Quaritch, 1905, p. 47.
† *Ibid.*, p. 47.

his brother Anthony passed in their early days beyond French bounds. As far as we know, Francis went no further than Paris. Anthony's wander-years were spent chiefly in the South of France, and while sojourning at Bordeaux he paid a visit to Montaigne."

In refutation of these statements, the letter of Thomas Bodley may be cited.* It is known from it that on the 19th October, 1577, Bacon was at Orleans. Spedding says Bacon went "from Paris to Blois, from Blois to Tours, from Tours to Poitiers, where in the autumn of 1577 he resided for three months." † But by far the most important testimony on this point is to be found in the life prefixed to the "Histoire Naturelle de Mre Francois Bacon, Baron de Verulam, Vicomte de Sainet Alban et Chancelier d'Angleterre" (Paris, 1631).‡ The translation is said to be by Pierre Amboise, and the translator was evidently the author of the biography which precedes it, and which is the earliest life published of the great Lord Chancellor. Here it is stated (page 8):—

"Ie veux dire qu'il employa dans le voyages quelques années de sa ieunesse, afin de polir son esprit, and façonner son iugément, par la pratique de toute sorte d'estrangers. La France, l'Italie and l'Espagne comme les nations les plus civilisées de tout le monde, purent celles où sa curiosité le porta. Et comme il se voyoit destiné pour tenir en iour en ses mains le timon du Royaume, au lieu de considerer seulement le païsage et la diversité des vestemens, comme sont la pluspart de ceux qui voyagent, il obseruoit iudicieusement les loix et less coustumes de pays où il passoit, remarquoit les diverses formes de gouvernement, les avantages on les deffaux d'un Estat, et toutes les autres choses qui

* BACONIANA, Vol. VI., Third Series, p. 40.
† "Spedding's Letters," &c., Vol. I., p. 7.
‡ BACONIANA, Vol. IV., Third Series, pp. 69—84 and 146—150.

pennent rendre un homme capable de gouverner les peuples."

Mr. Granville Cuningham drew attention* to the importance attributed to this life by Gilbert Wats, who, in introducing the testimonies to the merit of Bacon, prefixed to the 1640 edition of the "Advancement of Learning," speaks of it as "his (Mr. Pierre D'Ambois) just and elegant discourse upon the life of the author." The statement as to Bacon's travels in France, Italy and Spain appears to be authenticated beyond question. Is it the result of carelessness, or has Mr. Sidney Lee some ulterior motive in thus misstating the facts as to the travels of Francis?

It is probable that great interest will in the future centre round "The Arte of English Poesie," published in 1589 and subsequently on grounds which are wholly insufficient attributed to Puttenham. Mr. W. Stone Booth, in his recently published work,† mentions the reference made to the book by the late Rev. Walter Begley, in his "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio."

It is only right that attention should be drawn to the fact that it was Mr. Parker Woodward who first suggested Francis Bacon as its author. In Appendix IV., p. 110, to "The Strange History of Francis Tider," published in 1901, Mr. Woodward said, "I affirm that the following works to carry a strong suspicion of being the composition of Francis." He then mentions (1) "Certayne Notes of Instruction Concerning the Making of Verse or Ryme in English," Anon., 1275; (2) "Discourse of English Poetrie," William Webbe, 1586; (3) "Arte of English Poesie," Anon., 1589. There is

* BACONIANA, Vol. IV., p. 148.

† "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon." Constable and Co., 1909, p. 121.

in the pages which follow the history of how Puttenham's name came to be associated as author. In BACONIANA for April, 1905, pages 95—103, Mr. Woodward presents what he terms "a fair *prima facia* case for ascribing to Francis Bacon the authorship." In 1905 the Rev. Walter Begley published his "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," in which, Vol. I., pages 1—65, he deals exhaustively with the subject. It does not appear that any other Baconian has claimed the work for Bacon. Now Mr. Booth puts the authorship beyond question. He reproduces in his "Acrostic Signatures," pages 96—123, eight signatures of Bacon from "The Arte of English Poesie," and three from the "Partheniades." The first edition (1589) of the book is very rare. In 1811 was issued Haslewood's reprint, on the title page of which the author is stated to be "Webster alias George Puttenham." It is also reproduced in the Arber reprints published by Constable and Co.

Mr. C. N. Montgomery, of New York, claims to have discovered "*Shakespearean Anagrams*" in the lines "To the Reader," facing the Title-page of the 1623 folio, and elsewhere.

He explains his system as follows:—

"*In transposing these Shake-spearean Anagrams always use every letter, every punctuation mark, hyphen* and *apostrophe*. No changes can be made in the letters, *except by what seems to be the one rule of the author*, for example:—

"Two small u's (or v's) can be used to form a small w (and the reverse);

"Four small u's (or v's) can be used to form a double (or capital) W (and the reverse).

"Any letter can be exchanged for its own kind, and only for its own kind (as above), *i.e.*, a capital A can be

divided into two small a's, or two small a's can be doubled, to form a capital A; but a capital A cannot be divided into *one* small a, and any *other* small letter; nor can a capital A be used as one small a only. If a capital letter, like the A in 'Enclo-Ased' (in Ye Original 'Epitaph') is used at all, it must be used (in transposition) either as a capital A or as two small a's. (Francis Bacon cannot be spelled 'FraNcis bAcoN'!)

"In transposing the punctuation marks, two periods can be used as a colon (and the reverse); one period and a comma (or apostrophe) can be used as a semi-colon (and the reverse)."

Mr. Montgomery brings his method to bear upon the epitaph on the original tombstone on Shakespeare's grave. The peculiar characteristics of that epitaph might favour the view that it contains "cipher." Mr. Montgomery has succeeded in evolving the following:—

> "Dig, Honest Man dost thee forbear
> I SHAKE-SPEARE didst but enclose here
> Grave mystery below these stones
> Great codes instead of my Bones. Fs B."

There have been three lectures given under the auspices of the Society during the past quarter. On the 14th of May, at Miss Souter's, Park Road, N.W., Mr. Harold Bayley read a paper on "The Raumont of the Rose." On the 28th of May, Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., delivered his third lecture, the subject being "Francis Bacon as Political Thinker"; and on the 17th of June Sir Edward Durning Lawrence, at 13, Carlton House Terrace, answered the question "What does it matter whether the immortal works were written by Shakespeare (of Stratford) or by another who bore or assumed the same name?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In the announcement of my book on "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," which appears in your issue of April, I see that some correspondent has inspired an apocryphal story as to the reception of my book by a Harvard professor. This story is not only not true, but it misrepresents the attitude of academic men in general in this country. My work is being very carefully examined in Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and Columbia Universities. It is not to be expected that any man will hasten to shout his error from the house-top, but there is no reason to suppose that American scholars will pursue anything but a scientific spirit in their attitude towards my discovery. After all, facts are facts, and as a man born and trained in England, I am proud to be able to say that I have never found Americans prone to intellectual cowardice. It is a mistake to wanton with the sensibilities of one's opponents while they are freely and even generously examining unwelcome facts.

Please pay no attention to stories which are sprung from the imagination of men who, on the face of it, are more interested in a quarrel than in the cause of the truth which we wish to uncover.

Hoping that you can spare me this space,
I am, very faithfully yours, WM. S. BOOTH.

Cambridge, Mass., June 12, 1909.

Recent Objections to Bacon as the Author of Shakespeare.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

ON the 7th of June Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence gathered a large audience of Baconians and others, and read a very interesting and instructive paper on the question, "What does it matter whether the Shakespeare plays were written by William Shakspere, of Stratford, or by another man who bore or assumed the same name?" A discussion followed, and one of the guests spoke strongly, but not wisely, against the Baconian hypothesis. There was no resemblance, he maintained, between Bacon and Shakespeare, and Bacon's views about married life were such as Shakespeare could not have held. And then he quoted the opening sentence of "Bacon's Essay on Married and Single Life"—"He that hath wife and children hath given hostages to fortune; for they are impediments to great enterprises, either of virtue or

mischief." And with exaggerated assumption of moral disgust and triumph the speaker commented on these words,—"You, ladies, mothers or sisters, what do you think of that? You are *impediments* to virtue." Over and over again this calumniator of Bacon reiterated the sentiment which he attributed to Bacon, "Ladies! you are impediments to virtue." Of course Bacon never said anything so insane, nothing in the least approaching to it. Wife and children are, he said, impediments to *great enterprises*, whether of virtue or mischief,—but not to either virtue or mischief. Bacon habitually used English words in their original Latin sense, and the word impediments in this passage is really equivalent to the Latin word *impedimenta*, which means baggage or luggage. Bacon simply meant that a married man is *handicapped*; he cannot give his undivided attention to "great enterprises." Both his allegiance and his action are divided. Accordingly, as Bacon adds in the next sentence, "Certainly the best works and of greatest merit for the public have proceeded from unmarried or childless men." The sentiment may be unpalatable, but it is true; and no question of morals is involved in it—simply one of fact.

But my objector was not satisfied with this novel impeachment of Bacon. He proceeded,—"Bacon had some sections in his *Novum Organum* devoted to a discussion of the Idols of the mind: and one of these Idols is the '*Idols of the Theatre.*' Only fancy! this from a great dramatic author! Would such a writer speak of the Theatre as an Idol?" Of course, the objector blundered in a perfectly shocking way. The *Idols of the Theatre* are philosophical systems which give theories of life and human experience, not such as exist in nature—unreal life, such as a stage play might present, nor actual history. Bacon devotes several sections to illustrate this from Nos. 71 to 75 in *Nov. Org.* I.

Here is a typical anti-Baconian, who presumes to censure Bacon, attributing to him idiotic conceptions and impossible theories of life, while he takes not the least trouble to understand him, and judges of his ideas by detached sentences without any regard to the context. Probably this objector has never heard of the 9th Commandment; but whether he had or not, it is a sin against God and man to bear false witness against one's neighbour.

R. M. THEOBALD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There is a note on page 618 of Vol. II. of Nathan Drake's *Shakespeare and his Times* (1817) giving the following quotation from "Wheler's Guide to Stratford," p. 87: "If Shakespeare's and Lord Totness's tombs were erected by one and the same artist, circumstances not at all improbable, it would not appear that he (Thomas Stanton, the sculptor) had any want of skill in preserving a resemblance; for the monumental likeness of Lord

Totness strongly resembles him in Clopton House and at Gorhambury, in Hertfordshire, as well as the engraving of him prefixed to his 'Hibernia Pacata,' a posthumous publication in 1633." The reference to Gorhambury in relation to a piece of sculpture in the parish church of Stratford-on-Avon makes one curious to know something of the man whom it represents and his connection, if any, with the master of Gorhambury, but diligent search has so far failed to provide me with the desired information. There does not appear to be a copy of "Hibernia Pacata" in the British Museum. Can any reader of BACONIANA throw any light on the subject? S. T. W.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

"And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust?"
(*Hamlet* II. ii.).

SIR,—In my last article I cited the above words of Hamlet, in his contemplation of "*this goodly frame, the earth,*" in order to compare Bacon's view of the nature of man, and of the soul. In the First Book of the "Advancement of Learning," he says:—"So certainly if a man meditate upon the universal *frame of nature, the earth* with men upon it (the *divineness of souls* except) will not seem much better than an anthill, whereas some ants carry corn, and some carry their young, and some go empty, and all to and fro *a little heap of dust*" (p. 61, Book I., "Advancement of Learning").

This conception of man as *dust* is Scriptural: "For He knoweth whereof we are made; He remembereth that we are but dust" (Psalm ciii. 14).

Compare:—"Or my divine soul answer it to heaven."
(*K. Richard II.* Act. I. i. 38).

. . . . . .

"With the divine forfeit of his soul upon oath."
All's Well, Act. III. vi.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.